A Brief

REPLY

To a Late

ANSWER

TO

Dr. *HENRY MORE*

HIS

ANTIDOTE

Againſt

IDOLATRY.

Shewing

That there is nothing in the ſaid Anſwer that does any ways weaken his Proofs of *IDOLATRY* againſt the Church of *ROME*, and therefore all are bound to take heed how they enter into, or continue in the Communion of that Church as they tender their own Salvation.

---

1 Corinth. Chap. 5.

Be not deceived, neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers ſhall inherit the Kingdom of God.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. Redmayne*, for *Walter Kettilby* at the Sign of the Biſhops-Head in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, MDCLXXII.

2501.04

THE

PREFACE,

Chiefly conſiſting of an Anſwer to the Anſwerers Advertiſement, and the Preface or Introduction to his Anſwer.

WHAT my Antagoniſt gives notice of in his Advertiſement, I partly know to be true. For it is about two years ago, that the peruſal of this *Anſwer* of his, in M. S. was offered me; but I was then wholly taken up in writing my *Enchiridium Metaphyſicum*,

phyſicum, but yet promiſed that if he thought he had ſaid any thing that he in his own Conſcience judged to be material againſt my *Antidote* and would publish it, I would lay all aſide and Anſwer it forthwith ſo ſoon as it should come out. And whereas I was Informed that his language in ſeveral places was not ſo civil to me, I added this alſo, that my Reply to him should be without the leaſt ill word, but be made onely to matter of Argument. Wherefore ſince this Anſwer is come out, beſides other Obligations, I am by vertue of my Promiſe obliged to Reply to it; as alſo with the leaſt offenſive language that may be. Which Promiſe

miſe I hope I have abundantly performed.

But there is a paſſage or two more in his Advertiſement that I cannot but take notice of, as where he ſaith, *But now whereas, beſides Dr.* More, *Dr.* Stillingfleet *hath thought it not below his name and abilities to deſcend to the like foul and injurious Calumnies, in his late book Concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of* Rome, *&c.* I grant if they were Calumnies it would be a very vile condeſcenſion indeed in either of us to debaſe our ſelves ſo low, as to the doing of ſo great a wickedneſs. But when you ſpeak of its being below my Learned friends abilities to deſcend to ſuch a charge, methinks it ſeems to

imply, that any man of meaner Parts might eaſily make that charge good, you being ſo manifeſtly guilty thereof. Or as if you would complement us out of the ſtrongeſt hold that we have, *viz.* this juſt and true charge of Idolatry; that quitting this Caſtle you might the eaſilyer, as you think, take hold of us for Schiſmaticks and carry us back captive again into that Land of *Egypt* or *Babylon*. But this charge being true, as moſt certainly it is, it can be neither below the dignity of my worthy friend Dr. *Stillingfleet*, nor any one elſe, to inſiſt thereon, unleſs it be below any ones perſon to indeavour the ſaving of multitudes of Souls from

from eternal death, and the bodies of many innocent and conſcientious men from thoſe barbarous Cruelties your Religion exerciſes upon them, when you get power to do it with ſecurity. See the Preface of my Idea of Antichriſtianiſm, *Sect.* 4. 5, 6.

And whereas he ſays, He thinks the *publiſhing of this his Anſwer ſeaſonable for the undeceiving of the many unfortunately miſguided Souls, whoſe leaders (to ſpeak favourably) ſeem not to underſtand what themſelves Object*; it is a *Dilemma* of two hard Imputations, that pretends to gore us one way or other; as if we were either ſuch diſhoneſt perſons as to ſpeak againſt our own Conſciences, and pre-

tend we have reaſon when we know we have none, (which were it not the fault of your party, Controverſies betwixt us would ſoon ceaſe, & you would be no longer able to deceive the people) or elſe were at leaſt very ſilly fellows, and underſtood not what we ſay. Which my Reply, I hope, will abundantly confute, and undeceive thoſe unfortunately miſguided Souls, which your arts and ſlights have really impoſed upon. But for us, how can we miſlead any, who ſend them to the ancient, Primitive and Apoſtolick Conſtitution of our Chriſtian Religion, and ſuch as your ſelves cannot deny to be true? We lead them onely from the errors

rors and corruptions that ſince have crept into the Church. But thus you bemoan and weep over poor deludible Souls, whom you would make Proſelytes, till you have devoured them.

What you threaten of abler pens againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and boaſt of your own performance againſt Dr. *More*, as if there were nothing in Dr. *Stillingfleet* on this Subject, but what might be Anſwered out of this of yours againſt my ſelf; when it ſhall ſo manifeſtly appear that your Anſwer is ſo inſufficient to weaken any of the Evidences of my Charge of Idolatry againſt your Church, certainly then it will be eaſily concluded, that

that it can do no execution againſt his. And then for your threatening of abler pens, I do not fear their being overproportioned to the Ability of the Perſon they ſhall grapple with; Whoſe vigour of Youth, Wit, Parts, and copious Reading and Learning, might make him even heartily wish for ſuch an Encounter.

Optat aprum, aut fulvum deſcendere monte leonem.

I paſs now to my Antagoniſts *Preface* or *Introduction*, I know not whether to call it. But I had almoſt forgotten his Title-page, *A brief Anſwer to the many Calumnies of Dr.* Henry More, *&c.* Which language is too too harsh

harsh and falſe. I might indeed truly have intitled *my* Book, *A Brief Reply to the many Cavils*, &c. but I thought it not ſo adviſeable, becauſe the firmneſs and ſolidity of my *Replies* to his *Anſwers* do perpetually demonſtrate them to be but *Cavils* no true *Anſwers* to my charge. But it was the great prudence of my Adverſary to call my charges of Idolatry upon their Church, *Calumnies*, becauſe he might be conſcious to himſelf that his *Anſwers* to my Charges, whereby he would transform them into *Calumnies*, were ſo weak and dilute, and my Replies to them might be ſo ſtrong, that unleſs himſelf called them Calumnies the ſlow witted people might not

not eaſily take them to be ſo, no more than they can tell what to make of a bad picture, unleſs the name be writ under it, a Cock or a Cow, or the like.

There is but one thing more that I ſhall take notice of in the Title-page, which is the omitting to ſet his Name to his Book; ſo that I am as it were to combate with a Spectre in the dark. I could never learn any more concerning my Adverſary than that he was a Doctor of the *Roman* Church. For what reaſons he conceals his name I know not, I ſuppoſe he is not aſhamed of the Cauſe he undertakes, and I ſpeak ingenuouſly and as I think the Cauſe need not be aſhamed of ſuch an Advocate,

vocate, ſo far as I can judge of him by his performance. For it is the Fate and nature of this Cauſe, that no man can maintain it by Truth. And therefore to bring a true Argument againſt us in defenſe of it, would be to bring an impertinent one. For τὸ ἀληθὲς τῷ ἀληθεῖ πάντοτε συμφάδει, Truth always agrees with, never clashes with Truth, as *Ariſtotle* has noted. And therefore it is not to be imputed to the weakneſs of my Antagoniſt, but of his Cauſe, that with undeniable evidence I have perpetually confuted his Anſwers; though I believe he has brought as good as the Cauſe is capable of, and managed them and intermingled them with ſuch cir-

cum-

cumſtantial Rhetorical humours, ſlights and tricks, to make ſomething of nothing, and to make a ſhow of Anſwering and confuting me, that I muſt freely confeſs he is a complete Artiſt in that *Roman* Sophiſtry, whereby they become cunning Anglers for poor deceivable Souls. And thus much in ſhort upon his *Title-page* and *Advertiſement*.

We come now to his Introduction, which I ſhall caſt into ſo many Paragraphs, and ſo Anſwer them in order.

Paragraph the firſt.

Dr. Henry More *is a Perſon whoſe Learning and Parts have brought him into a name, among the Profeſſors of the*

the refined Arts and Sciences. Fame ſpeaks him a great Philoſopher, And his Publick works are ſaid to avouch no leſs. Nay ſome have paſſed ſo far in favour of his Character as to term him, The great Reſtorer of the Platonick Cabbala. *And truly, if this be ſo, I conceive the Gentleman had done himſelf a great deal of right, if he had ſtill kept to his own Element; for as much as his late unlucky ingaging in Controverſial Diſputes, cannot but prove a blot to his former undertakings: For the Learned world muſt needs acknowledge that* Dr. More *the* Controvertiſt, *is much degenerated from* Dr. More *the* Philoſopher.

The Anſwer.

Here obſerve the art and ſmooth

ſmooth cunning of my Adverſary, who drives at theſe two things: Firſt to make show of a great deal of equity and candor of judgment, in acknowledging, notwithſtanding the Controverſie betwixt us, that I am not altogether nothing in matters of Philoſophy, but have writ with ſome ſucceſs and acceptance on ſuch Subjects; that he thus ſeeming ſo impartial and indifferent a man, and ſo readily acknowledging any thing well done by me, he may the more eaſily be believed where he gives judgment againſt me, and ſays, That though I be ſomething ſucceſſfull indeed in Philoſophy, yet I am very unlucky and unskilfull

full in Theological Diſputes, a tolerable *Philoſopher*, but a very mean *Controvertiſt* in points of Divinity. The other drift is, to make me, if it were poſſible, to melt and relent, that I have thus leſſened my credit in the world by my unfortunately ingageing in Controverſies betwixt us and the Church of *Rome*, as if he bemoaned my misfortune therein; who if I had kept to my own Element of Philoſophy, might have been gratious and acceptable with all the world, with the Pontifician party as well as with the reformed, and kept up my Credit in force with all, when as now I have hugely impaired my repute, at leaſt with thoſe of his Party.

But to the first I Answer, That though this Intimation of his own Impartiality be craftily enough managed, yet that general acknowledged Testimony of my suffering in Philosophy is a witness against himself. For if I have been so usefull and succesfull in my *Philosophical* demonstrations of the *existence* of *God* and *Immaterial Beings*, in the vindication of *Divine Providence*, in the proving of the *Immortality of the Soul*, and in finding the ancient *Judaical Cabbala*, (which the *Platonick Philosophy* is so near akin to,) so artificially couched in the Text of *Moses*, and the like, all which tend to the honour and safety of the Christian Religion, the same clearness

of

of ſight which helps me to diſcern and judge of theſe things, cannot but inable me to judge alſo in thoſe concerning points that are betwixt you and us; As that eye that can ſee one colour right, is not confined to that colour, but by the ſame faculty and ſoundneſs of ſight can ſee another. And it is more my impartialneſs and unprejudicedneſs than any thing elſe that makes me ſee ſo clearly and ſo truely in any thing.

As to the ſecond, my Adverſary has ſuggeſted no more, nor ſo much as I have diverſe times reflected upon my ſelf, and was well aware of before I meddled with theſe kind of Controverſies: namely that it

would leſſen my repute and favour with many. But *if I ſeek to pleaſe men, how ſhall I be the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Gal.* 1.10. And as for the buſineſs of Repute and Eſteem in the world, I thank God I am convinced even from my very Heart and Soul, that I ought to be utterly dead to all *Self-joy* and *Self-gloriation*, and therefore if any thing happen croſs to that life, that ought to be mortified in me, if it moves me not, I am at peace; if it does, it is yet the gift of God to me, and I am admoniſhed thereby to advance further into that death, by the power and Spirit of Chriſt, that will at length lay aſleep all ſuch di-

disturbances in my Soul for ever. And there are greater matters than the esteem of men, which I am not insensible, but have always been well aware that I run the hazard of, and such as that wisdom, which is according to the Spirit of this world, sets the greatest esteem of all upon. But this I thank God could never affright me into the neglect of so undispensable a duty, as the declaring so important truth, so exceeding clear to my self, and of so unspeakable consequence for the Church of God, and for the settling of a true grounded peace in the Christian world, That there might be truely one flock and one

Sheepfold, and Jeſus Chriſt the true Shepherd over all; which cannot be till ſuch Barbarous and Idolatrous Laws and Inſtitutes be reverſed as obtain ſtill in the Papacy. But for my part, my great Fort and Shelter againſt all the Inconveniences I expoſe my ſelf to, by my juſt liberty of ſpeech, is to keep as near as I can in that frame of ſpirit which our Saviour commends to us in that Precept of his, *Matth.* 5.44. *Love your enemies, bleſs them that curſe you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that deſpightfully uſe you and perſecute you. Father forgive them for they know not what they do,* Luk.23.34. This is the Sanctuary I deſire to take ſhelter in, even in that ineffably

bly profound and humble Spirit of unſelf-intereſſed Love, which I infinitely prefer before all the keenneſs of wit and crafty prudence of the Spirit of this world, that ſo ſubtily ſhifts for it ſelf, which I envy no mans uſe or injoyment of, may but my Soul ſufficiently incorporate with this lovely Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, may that be the lot of mine inheritanec, both in this life and for ever. For this is that which is truely invincible indeed, and will eaſily put by any ſuch thruſt as my Adverſary has offered at me in this Paragraph.

Paragraph the ſecond.

He has lately ſet forth an Expoſition *of the ſeven Epiſtles to the ſeven Churches of* Aſia. *The whole piece is of a pure Romantick ſtrain, wherein the Authours fancy being broken looſe from the command of* Reaſon, *and leaping over all boundaries of Church-Authority, and the faith of his Anceſtors, runs on at eleven-ſcore, as if he were upon a warm ſcent, giving chaſe to ſome of his* Platonical *Idea's.*

The Anſwer.

This is indeed a pretty pleaſant Rhetorical career, but what it would affirm in plain English is this, That my Expoſition

poſition of the Epiſtles to the ſeven Churches is but a mere phancy. And the Arguments he offers at to prove his Aſſertion are theſe, That it is againſt Church-Authority, againſt the Faith of our Anceſtors, and that I have brought no Reaſons to prove it. As to the Authority of the Church, there was never any general Council, nor any other that I know, that ever declared that ſuch a Prophetical ſenſe as I have given of theſe ſeven Epiſtles is falſe, nor for any doctrine that clashes with any thing ſuppoſed in my Expoſition, while the Church continued Symmetral, I mean before her Apoſtaſy. But in that the ancient Fathers de-

declared, upon the removal *of that which hindereth*, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 6. that the Apoſtaſy of the Church would inſue, and the appearing of Antichriſt, they expounding alſo the τὸ κατέχον of the intireneſs of the *Roman* Empire, that is conſonant to my Expoſition of thoſe ſeven Epiſtles and to the aſſigned Interval of *Pergamus*.

But now in that he inſinuates I have brought no Reaſon for my Expoſition, I think I have brought no leſs then demonſtration for it. And I think any one that has a Genius to read and judge of ſuch things will eaſily acknowledge it upon the conſiderate peruſal of my Expoſition, and ſerious pondering

dering the tenth Chapter, wherein the ſtrength thereof is more briefly repreſented. If we can in the contemplation of Anatomy in the body of an Animal, obſerving how all the parts conſpire to one end, (the convenient functions of life for ſuch an Animal,) conclude a Providence therein; certainly upon taking notice, that the whole frame of all theſe Epiſtles and the order of them, the notations of the proper names not excepted, do all intirely tend (as all the flesh of an Animal is made into muſcles for fit and due motions for that Animal) to ſet out the ſtate of the Church in ſeven intire Intervals from the beginning

ning to the end, this is as certain a ſign that theſe Epiſtles are ſuch a Divine Prediction or Prophecy, as ſuch an Anatomy is of ſuch a piece of Divine Providence in that Creature.

Paragraph the third.

To this he has adjoyned a pretended Antidote againſt Idolatry, *with Application to the Council of* Trent, *and for the putting a ſtop (as he phraſes it) to the* Romiſh *Infection. His moſt formidable weapon is that harſh and unmanly* Rhetorick *called* Railing. *His phraſe is rough and clogged with much dirt, which he throws too bountifully upon perſons which never deſerved it at his hands. His Objecti-*

ons

ons are bold, uncivil, irreligious; not without a deep tincture of Geneva.

The Answer.

My useing nor affecting any other Rhetorick but plain propriety of Speech or Scripture phrase, applied to things that are true, that is that which makes it both harsh and formidable to those that are friends to falshood. And this it is which they call Railing: Such as when I call Idolatry, Idolatry, and Pagan-like Idolatry, Pagan-like Idolatry, and the unjust and cruel killing of innocent men, barbarous murder. But that it should be unmanly

manly to ſpeak truth I under-
ſtand not, or yet ungentile in
ſuch neceſſary occaſions as theſe.
Τὸ ἀληθεύειν, to ſpeak Truth was
one of the main characters of a
Gentleman amongſt the *Perſians*
though Pagans, ſo that it is a ſad
thing that it ſhould be ungen-
tile ſo to do amongſt Chriſtians.
And why is my phraſe ſaid to be
rough and clogged with much
dirt, but that it expreſſes ſuch
things as are ſcabrous and dir-
ty. A Poet or Painter deſcribing
a Leper or a man newly taken
up out of a pit of mire, if their
pens or pencils deſcribe true, by
you they muſt be called rough
or clogged with much dirt or
mire. In the mean time it is a
ſad caſe that the conſtitution of

your

your Religion is ſuch that we cannot ſet it down in proper and ſignificant language but we muſt ſeem to rail at you in your own judgements, though we ſpeak onely the Truth. And for his talking of my throwing dirt upon perſons, For my part I have no perſonal controverſie with any, but onely declare againſt the corruptneſs of the *Roman* Religion, with which they indeavour to infect the people, and againſt their Idolatry in particular. Which I do out of a ſpirit of common charity both to them and our ſelves, wishing not the leaſt hurt to them in any regard, but being ready to ſerve them in what is fit and in my power

to

to ſerve them, in any thing.

My Objections indeed are bold becauſe I have clear truth on my ſide, but they can ſeem uncivil and irreligious onely to your ſelves, becauſe it is a ruffling as it were, by rude reaſon, of your trim Formalities in your ſuperſtitious and Idolatrous Worship which you call Religion. But as for the deep Tincture of *Geneva*, I am as much a ſtranger to it as to *Rome*, but ready to receive of either any uſefull truth I am as yet unacquainted with. But where they offer Errors I am as little concerned in the one as in the other.

Pa-

Paragraph the Fourth.

And therefore were it not, that the Opinion of his ſuppoſed Abilities, may caſt a favourable reflection upon all that iſſues from his brain, and gain Credit to his Antidote amongſt his vulgar Zealots, to the irreparable dammage of their Souls, his work might have lain neglected, as without a Reader, *ſo without an Adverſary. But in regard the Doctor has prefixed his Name to the Book as Author, and that a great Name is a great Argument with ſome to evince the truth of the Contents, and that no doctrine is ſo abſurd but may ſpread under the profeſſed Patronage of a famed Divine; therefore*

ſome things muſt be ſaid by way of Rejoynder to the Antidote, leaſt ſome unwary Readers ſeeing the Doctor ſo full gorged againſt Popiſh Idolatry, and repeating his Invectives almoſt in every page with endleſs tautologies, ſhould tamely ſuffer themſelves to be borne down the ſtream with big words, and think all is Goſpel and well-grounded, that falls with ſo much noiſe and confidence from the mouth of a Doctor.

The Anſwer.

The brief account of this long Paragraph is this: That he would make his own believe, that there is nothing but my Name, my degree in Divinity

.vinity, and the confidence of my affirming thoſe things whereof in my Antidote I do pronounce, that makes my Book taken notice of, but that it would be of it ſelf the weakeſt and moſt worthleſs thing that ever was penned. Which if it be ſo, my Antagoniſt has had a fair opportunity with eaſe to raiſe his Trophies on ſo great a Name, as he is pleaſed to call it, and ſo mean Performance. And my Arguments being ſo plain, and ſuch as are not above the meaneſt Capacity, if his Anſwers are as plain and bear covincing truth with them, he need not fear but he will take away all the credit

he ſays my Antidote has obtained amongſt my vulgar Zealots, to the irreparable dammage of their Souls. But in the mean time that is either perverſly or unskilfully inſinuated; As if there could be no zeal againſt Idolatry but it muſt be a ſign of a vulgar Spirit, (ſo gentile a thing is it in contempt of God and his holy Commandments to complement Idols or Images) or as if their being reclaimed from or fortified againſt Idolatry could be any prejudice to their Souls.

Pa-

Paragraph the fifth.

And indeed I am already informed that ſome well-meaning Proteſtants, who have a great kindneſs for the Author and no leſs value for the Work, have called for an Anſwer to it with a kind of inſulting accent, as conceiving no ſuch Anſwer could be given. They (poor Souls) thinking, that ſurely the Doctor would never have been ſo poſitive in his Aſſertions, if the ſtrength of his evidences were not ſuch as might bear all the ſtreſs he lays upon them.

The Anſwer.

It was but a plain expreſſion

of their confidence I dare ſay, which the heighth of my Adverſaries Rhetorick calls Inſultation, in that they profeſſed they conceived my Antidote to be a Book unanſwerable. And it is a ſign to me that they duely underſtood the weight and ſolidity of my Arguments, that they did with ſuch confidence pronounce them unanſwerable. And I hope upon the peruſal of my Reply to my Adverſaries pretended Anſwer, not onely thoſe that have a kindneſs for me, but all lovers of the Truth will acknowledge them unanſwerable; And that thoſe are no ſuch poor Souls in his ſenſe, in that they deemed

my

my Arguments no leſs ſtrong than my ſelf was poſitive in aſſerting of them, but that they are perſons of a clear and perſpicacious Judgment.

The ſixth and laſt Paragraph.

Wherefore ſeeing the concern of Souls is at ſtake, whom he ſeeks by a pernicious wile to ſeduce, venting poyſon gilded over with the ſpecious title of an Antidote; the deſign of theſe few pages is to ſum up briefly the Doctors Arguments, allowing to each a due reflection, and to repreſent the nullity and inconcluſiveneſs of all that is material in him as to his foul and odious Charge of Idolatry, drawn up againſt his, and our common Mother Church.

The Anſwer.

This is fine Rhetorick again, and an high boaſt, as if he could ſo eaſily bring the ſolidity and firmneſs of my demonſtrations to a mere Nullity. Some men build Caſtles in the Air, and others think they can batter down Caſtles on the Earth though built on Rocks, although they have nothing but water-ſquirts or elder-guns to diſcharge againſt them. But it is a pious deſign he undertakes, as if it were the concern of Souls not to be ſufficiently heedfull how they commit Idolatry; or as if I could

ſeek

ſeek by pernicious wiles to ſeduce them into the ancient pure Apoſtolick way, unto that faith and practiſe which was in uſe and the known way to Heaven before that grand Apoſtaſy into theſe groſs Idolatries ſeized the Church. And why should any Soul be afraid of being deceived by me, when I show them no other way then what upon a free and impartial ſearch I find to be true and go in my ſelf, driving on no worldly Intereſt at all in my choice thereof, or in my charity of showing it to others, I getting not a peny for my pains, nor expecting nor deſiring any thing, nay it being

ing even according to my Adverſaries own acknowledgement, againſt my worldly Intereſt. *But the love of Chriſt conſtraineth me,* as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, 2 *Cor.* 5.14. which extendeth it ſelf to your Church as well as to my own. For He would all men ſhould be ſaved and leave thoſe ways that lead to eternal death.

Nor would our charge of Idolatry, being true, prove odious to you, but that you hate the light that would convince you, becauſe your deeds are evil. But for drawing any ſuch Charge againſt my own Church, I am ſo far from it, that I have clearly Vindicated her

her from all ſuſpition of Anti-chriſtianiſm, of which Idolatry is no mean part, at the end of my *Synopſis Prophetica.* Nor know I what common Mother you and I can have, unleſs you would become a Convert to the Truth, and forsake all the groſs corruptions and Idolatries of the Church of *Rome.* For ſo we may be both members of the ancient Apoſtolick Church, and Sons of *that* Jeruſalem *which is above, which is the Mother of us all,* Gal. 4. 26.

And thus I have Anſwered each Paragraph in my Antagoniſts *Preface* or *Introduction.* In my Replies to his Anſwers I ſhall not always covet to ſet down

down his Text ſo intire, For it would ſwell the Volume into too big a bulk; but for both ſhortneſs and perſpicuity diſ-. enveloping what pretended ſtrength of Argument there may be, from the manifold heterogeneous humours and ſtrains of Art and Rhetorick, I ſhall bring the bare edge of his Objections againſt my Antidote and then Reply to them, which I ſuppoſe will be leſs tedious to the Reader. For if I ſhould bring in ſuch things as are not eſſential to the Cauſe, I muſt alſo be ſo impertinent as to Anſwer them, and ſo we ſhall make ſo long a ſtory of it betwixt us that the Reader

may

may fall asleep before he gets half way, which is ordinarily the fate of these Books of *Answers* and *Replies*.

But this Volume consisting of the Text of my Antidote, each Chapter being prefixt before his *Answers* to the Conclusions or Paragraphs of them, and my *Replies* set under each *Answer*, I hope it may prove as little tedious, and it may be more pleasant than if I had done all along as some do in their own Treatises, raise Objections at the end of each Chapter, or upon each Point, and so Answer them.

And I will assure thee, Reader, that with all possible faith-

faithfulneſs and to my beſt skill I have repreſented the utmoſt ſtrength of his Anſwers where I have not brought his Text intire. Of which if thou haſt any doubt, his Book is not great ſo that thou maiſt ſatisfie thy ſcrupuloſity at a very reaſonable rate.

As for his harsh language to me, I very ſeldom take notice of it in my *Replies*, nor will I here concern my ſelf to collect any ſpecimens of it. For I have no mind to quarrel but onely to defend the Truth, let people reproach my Perſon as they pleaſe, and am at perfect peace with my Adverſary, even while I am inforced to enter

this

this Combate with him. Of which I desire thee, Reader, to be a diligent and impartial Spectator. For there is not a more material point can be controverted, nor of greater necessity throughly to be understood, than this charge of Idolatry upon the Church of *Rome*.

An

The more conſiderable ERRATA Correct thus.

Preface p.16. l.6. for ſuffering *r.* ſufficiency. *p.21. l.12. r.* inheritance.

PAge 17. l. penult. r. *as well as.* p. 21. l. 30. for *muſt* r. *moſt.* p. 24: l. 18. for *ruin* r. *mince.* p. 25. l. 21. r. ἄγω. l. 25. for *application* r. *appellation.* p. 32. l. 16. for *empty* r. *imply.* p. 35. l. 18. r. *as ridiculous* p. 37. l. 12. for *as* r. *if.* l. 31. for *Now* r. *Nor.* p. 43. l. 23. r. *ſo ſay I.* p. 65. l. 24. r. *chanceableneſs.* p. 66. l. 11. for *the* r. *that.* p. 69. l. 6. for *none* r. *not.* p. 88. l. 3. r. αυτκδη. p. 89. l. 20. for *thirteen* r. *nineteen.* for *all* r. *moſt.* l. 21. for *toward* r. *at* p. 98. l. 3. Eſt. p. 101. l. 10. for *commemoration* r. *commemorative.* p. 142. l. 6. r. *perfect.* p. 187. l. 23. r. *on him.* (*John* 7. 37,38.) p. 207. l. 10. r. *God.* p. 208. l. 25. r. *imbued.* p. 218. l. 1. for *it* r. *is.* l. 20. for *induing* r. *ending.* p. 241. l. 9. r. *through.* p. 296. l. 4. for *them* r. *there.* p. 312. l. 23. r. *Dialogues.* p. 314. l. 7. r. *enervate.*

THE ANTIDOTE AGAINST IDOLATRY.

CHAP. I.

what is Idolatry *according to Divine Declaration.*

1. THere are two ways in general of diſcovering what is or ought to be held to be Idolatry amongſt Chriſtians; the one, Divine Declaration, the other, clear and perſpicuous Reaſons: Which though they may haply reach the one no farther than the other, that is to ſay, that whatſoever may be concluded to be Idolatry by Divine Declaration, the ſame may alſo by unprejudiced Reaſon, and *vice verſâ*; yet their joint concurrence of Teſtimony is a greater aſſurance to us of the Truth; and two cords twiſted together are ſtronger than either ſingle. Wherefore we will make uſe of both, and begin with Divine Declaration firſt.

2. The firſt Concluſion therefore ſhall be, That as in civil Governments it is the Right of the Supreme Power to define and declare what ſhall be or be held to be Treaſon, and puniſhable as ſuch: ſo it is moſt manifeſtly

the Right of God *Almighty*, who is alſo infinitely *good* and *wiſe*, to define and declare to his people what ſhall be or be held to be Idolatry, which is a kind of Treaſon againſt God, or *crimen læſæ majeſtatis Divinæ*. And what is thus declared Idolatry by God is to be held by us to be ſuch, though the Ludicrouſneſs and Fugitiveneſs of our wanton Reaſon might otherwiſe find out many ſtarting-holes and fine pretences to excuſe this thing or that action from ſo foul an Imputation.

But as in civil affairs the declaring ſuch and ſuch things to be Treaſon, does in a Political ſenſe make them ſo *ipſo facto*: ſo God's declaring ſuch and ſuch things to be Idolatry, they do to us *ipſo facto* become Idolatry thereby: though to an ordinary apprehenſion, perhaps, neither this would have ſeemed Treaſon, nor that Idolatry, without theſe antecedent Declarations. But where the Law-giver is *infallible*, there is all the reaſon in the world we ſhould ſubmit not onely to his Power, but to his Judgement in the Definitions of things, and reſt ſure that that is Idolatry which he has thought fit to declare ſo to be.

3 The ſecond Concluſion; That what is declared Idolatry by God to the *Jews* ought to be acknowledged Idolatry by us *Chriſtians*. The ground of this Concluſion is fixed in the nature of the Chriſtian Religion. For *Chriſtianity* being a far more ſpiritual Religion than that of *Judaiſm*, and therefore abhorring from all Superſtition, there cannot be the leaſt Relaxation to the moſt rancid of all Superſtitions, Idolatry it ſelf. Wherefore whatſoever was accounted Idolatry amongſt the *Jews*, and ſo defined by a Divine Law, muſt be reckoned much more ſuch under *Chriſtianity*, there being not the leaſt pretence for any Relaxation.

Beſides, there was nothing under the *Jews* (or can by any people be) rightly deemed Idolatry, but it is carefully enough cautioned againſt and plainly forbid in the

the firſt and ſecond Commandments of the Decalogue. But the whole Decalogue is Moral, and ſo declared by God, in that it is ſaid to be writ by his own finger on the Tables of ſtone, *Exod.* 31. 18. (which are Symbols of the permanent ſubſtance of our Souls, on which all the general Precepts of Morality are ingraven as innate Notions of our Duty.) And therefore it is hereby intimated that the Precepts of the Decalogue are juſt and fitting, not onely νόμῳ, but φύσει, not onely by an external Law, but engraffed in our very Nature and Reaſon; and that the root and ground of them will eaſily be fetch'd from thence.

To which you may add, That it were a very immethodical and heterogeneous Botch, unworthy of the Wiſdom of God and of his ſervant *Moſes*, when as all the reſt of the Decalogue is Moral, to phanſie one or two of the Commandments of another nature. This is ſo raſh and groſs a Reproach to the Divine Wiſdom as truly, in my judgement, ſeems unexcuſable.

But beſides this, The Morality of the Decalogue is alſo acknowledged by the Church, it making part of their Liturgy every-where, and we begging an ability of obeying the Second Commandment as well as the reſt: and *Chriſt* alſo refers to the Decalogue for eternal life, *Mark* 10. 18, 19.

And laſtly, It ſeems as it were ſingled from all the reſt of *Moſes* Laws, as a laſting and permanent Law to the Church of God, (whence it is entred into our very Catechiſms,) never to be aboliſhed, or rather vigorouſly to be kept in force, for the Second Commandment's ſake particularly, that it might ſtrongly bear againſt thoſe Invitations to Idolatry, that may ſeem to offer themſelves in the nature of our Religion, or reclaim the Church from it when they were fallen into it, as well as it was to keep back the *Jews* from joyning in Worſhip with their Idolatrous neighbors round about them.

Wherefore all manner of Idolatry being cautioned againſt by the Moral Decalogue given to the *Jews*, there are no kinds thereof that ought to be entertained or allow'd of by any Chriſtians.

4. The third Concluſion; That what-ever was Idolatry in the Heathen, the ſame is Idolatry in us, if we commit it. The reaſon of which Aſſertion is this, Becauſe the Heathen had not ſo expreſs a Declaration from God againſt all manner of Idolatry as the *Jews* and *Chriſtians* have: and therefore where-ever they are guilty of Idolatry, the *Jew* and *Chriſtian*, if they do the like things, are much more.

The fourth Concluſion; The Idolatry of the Pagans conſiſted in this, *viz.* in that they either took ſomething to be the ſupreme God that was not, and worſhipped it for ſuch; or elſe worſhipped the ſupreme God in an Image; or gave religious Worſhip, that is to ſay, erected Altars, Temples and Images, offered Sacrifice, made Vows to, and invoked, ſuch as they themſelves knew not to be the ſupreme God, but either the Souls of men departed, or other *Dæmons*, or elſe particular Appearances or Powers of Nature.

The fifth; That both Divine Declaration and the common Conſent of Chriſtendom do avouch to us, that all the aforeſaid Pagan Modes of Idolatry practiſed by them were in thoſe Pagans practices of Idolatry. And therefore, by the third Concluſion, they muſt be much more ſo in either the *Jew* or *Chriſtian*.

5. The ſixth; That giving religious Worſhip, that is to ſay, erecting Temples, building Altars, Invoking, making Vows, and the like, to what is not the ſupreme God, though not as to him, but as to ſome inferiour helpfull Being, is manifeſt Idolatry. This is plain out of the precedent Concluſion; and may be farther confirmed from this Conſideration, That Idolatry was very rank amongſt the Nations, eſpecially the *Romans*, if this Mod

Mode of Idolatry be not truly Idolatry. And ſcarce any thing will be found Idolatry amongſt them, but taking that to be the ſupreme God which is not, and worſhipping it for ſuch. But if any Being on this ſide the ſupreme God may be worſhipped with religious Worſhip void of Idolatry, all things may, though ſome more nonſenſically and ridiculouſly than others. Wherefore to uſe any of the aboveſaid Modes of Worſhip to what is inferiour to the ſupreme Being, though not as to the ſupreme Being, muſt be Idolatry; or elſe the *Roman* Paganiſm it ſelf is very rarely, if at all, chargeable therewith, they having a Notion accurate enough of the ſupreme God, and diſtinct enough from their other Deities; ſo that unleſs they chance to worſhip him in an Image, they will ſeldom be found Idolaters, or rather never, according to the opinion of ſome, who ſay, none that have the knowledge of the one true God can be capable of Idolatry.

6. The ſeventh; That to ſacrifice, burn Incenſe, or make any religious Obeiſance or Incurvation to an Image in any wiſe, as to an Object of this Worſhip, is Idolatry by Divine Declaration. This is manifeſt out of the ſecond Concluſion and the firſt, as may appear at firſt ſight. For it is plainly declared in the ſecond Precept of the Decalogue touching Images, *Thou ſhalt not bow to them, nor worſhip them*: Of which undoubtedly the ſenſe is, They ſhall not be in any wiſe the Object of that Worſhip which thou performeſt in a religious way, whether by Bowing down to them, or by what other way ſoever. For the ſecond Commandment certainly is a Declaration of the mind of God touching religious Worſhip, let the Ceremonies be what they will.

The eighth; That to erect Temples, Altars, Images, or to burn Incenſe, to Saints or Angels, to invoke them, or make Vows to them, and the like, is plain Idolatry. This is apparent chiefly out of the third, fourth, fifth

and ſixth Concluſions of this Chapter. For the Pagans *Dæmons* exquiſitely anſwer to the Chriſtians Saints and Angels in this point; ſaving that this ſpiritual Fornication is a Rape upon our Saints and Angels, but ſimple fornication in the Heathen with their impure *Dæmons.*

The ninth; Religious Incurvation towards a Crucifix, or the Hoſt, or any Image, as to an Object, and not a meer unconſidered accidental Circumſtance, is Idolatry. This is manifeſt out of the ſeventh and eighth Concluſions. But the Worſhip of *Latria* exhibited to the Hoſt upon the opinion of Tranſubſtantiation is Idolatry by the third and fourth.

7. Concluſion the tenth; To uſe on ſet purpoſe in religious Worſhip any Figure or Image onely *circumſtantially*, not *objectively*, but ſo as to bow towards it, or to be upon a man's knees before it with Eyes and Hands devoutly lifted up towards it, but with an intention of making it in no ſenſe any Object of this religious Worſhip, yet if this were in a Country where men uſually and profeſſedly do, it were notwithſtanding for all this intention a groſs piece of Idolatry.

But if the whole Country ſhould conſpire to make this more plauſible ſenſe of thoſe Incurvations and Poſtures; admit we might hope it were not Idolatry, yet it would be certainly a moſt impious and wicked Mocking of God, and eluding his mind in the ſecond Commandment, (that naturally implies the forbidding any Worſhip or Incurvation toward Images in a way of Religion,) and a crime as ſcandalous and near to Idolatry as the going into bed to another man's Wife, with chaſt pretenſions, would be to groſs Adultery.

Nay, indeed, it is very queſtionable, if he knowingly and deliberately put himſelf into theſe poſtures before an Image, whether the Image will not be the Object of thoſe Poſtures and Incurvations whether he will or no.

Or

Or rather it ſeems plain, beyond all queſtioning, that it will be ſo. For there is a corporeal Action ſignificative of Honour and Reſpect corporeally (though not mentally) directed towards and received by the Image, and this at the choice of the Religioniſt, which intitles him to the fact.

But we need not labour much touching this laſt Concluſion, the two former abundantly convincing the Church of *Rome* of multifarious Idolatries, if they will ſtand to Divine Definitions, or the Declarations of Holy Scripture touching this point.

ANSWERS AND REPLIES

On CHAP. I.

His Anſwer to the firſt Concluſion.

To this Concluſion, ſaith my Adverſary, I onely return this Remark; That the learned Simile, wherein the Doctour ſpends many words, might very well have been diſpenced with, without any offence to Logick or impeachment to the Authors judgement. For the Simile ſeems to aim at the clearing and ſetting the unqueſtionable Prerogative of an increated Power, upon the right of a meer humane Juriſdiction: which is in effect, an unskilfull piece of Hyſteron proteron, *making a truth of the higheſt rank to truckle under an inferiour Principle: Which, conſidering there is no Power but of God, (* Rom. 13. *) can have no truth in it, but by preſuppoſing that very truth which it pretends to illuſtrate and eſtabliſh.*

The Reply.

THis is a very remarkable Remark indeed, and ſuch as gives timely notice of the de-

ſign

ſign of my Antagoniſt, which is to make a ſhow of ſaying ſomething to every Concluſion, though he knows in his own Conſcience, being of that wit and parts that he is, that it is really nothing to the purpoſe, as moſt certainly this is not. For I do not go about to eſtabliſh the Prerogative of an uncreated Power upon the right of humane Juriſdiction; but the Argument is *à Comparatis*, That if the ſupreme Power amongſt men, have the right to define and declare, *&c.* Then much more or moſt abundantly clear it is, that it is the right of God Almighty, who is infinitely good and wiſe, to define and declare, *&c.* Our Saviour (*Mat* 7.) argues thus, *If men being evil give good gifts to their children, how much more will our Heavenly Father give good gifts to them that ask him.* Does he there eſtabliſh the bounty of God on the bounty of evil men; but argues *à Minori*, if they that are leſs willing and able to do good, notwithſtanding do it, much more will God who is goodneſs it ſelf, and infinitely able and willing to do good, be ſure to do good to thoſe that call upon him. And ſo ſay I, If it be the right of finite Mortals, that have the ſupreme Power, to define and declare, it is much more, or moſt of all true in God Almighty, who is alſo infinitely good and wiſe, that he hath the right to define and declare, *&c.* So that my Antagoniſt, without any Offence againſt Logick or impeachment to his Judgement, might have ſaved himſelf the labour of this aſſault upon my firſt Concluſion, and ingenuouſly confeſſed it as it is, impregnable and inexpugnable.

His

His Answer to the second Conclusion.

His assault also on my second Conclusion is very oblique and elusory. Now, says he, *that the whole Decalogue is moral he makes some needless attempts to prove, chiefly for the second Commandments sake. All which proofs it is easy to take off by this single Answer: I say then, as to the second Commandment, if he expound it so as onely to Prohibit the making or worshipping of Idols or Images of false Gods, I shall readily grant it to be moral and strictly binding both the* Jews *and* Christians: *But if he puts any other meaning on the Text, he begs the Question, and he must excuse me if I call for his further proof,* &c. *The sense of which Answer in brief is this, That though he acknowledge the whole Decalogue moral, (Else why does he say I make needless attempts to prove it?) yet if I expound the Morality of the second Commandment so as that I would thereby show it unlawfull to worship any Images saving of false Gods, which he calls Idols, that it will not go down with him, unless I more fully prove the Morality of this Commandment to extend also to the Prohibition of worshipping any Image suppose of the true God, or of Saints and good Angels: This is the full sense and scope of this first Answer. But he comes in also with a secondly, That some both Catholick and Protestant Divines own no more then a Ceremonial Precept in the second Commandment, if extended to any Universal Prohibition of all Images,*

Images, and under that notion given onely to the Jews.

The Reply.

In Reply to the First; I first take notice, That he is fain to pass over my first ground of this second Conclusion as too hard for him to deal with, namely the Spirituality of our Christian Religion. Which ground being unshaken, the second Conclusion remains firm, from Instances of *Jewish* Idolatry in Scripture.

But now for the extent of the Moral sense of the second Commandment of the Decalogue, that it should forbid the bowing to any Images whatsoever in the way of Religion or Devotion, the words aptly spreading to that latitude; In the first place I say, My Adversary should bring reason to the contrary: For we are with fear and reverence to receive the Laws of God in such an extent or latitude of sense, as, it being natural, will be most effectual to keep us from sinning against them. Otherwise, if my Adversary would be still more humoursom, and would say, That stealing from a man of another Religion, killing of him, or coveting his goods were Lawfull; and I should produce those Commandments against him, *Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not covet*, &c. He might roundly reply after his Fashion, that if I understand them of stealing from, killing or coveting any ones goods but theirs of our own Religion, I beg the Question. Which consideration alone, methinks, should make any one sensible

ſide of the great abſurdity of his Anſwer to the preſent caſe of worſhipping of Images.

But yet again in the ſecond place, I ſay it is neceſſary and inevitable to underſtand the ſecond Commandment in that extent of ſenſe that I ſuppoſe it to have: For it is manifeſt, that the ſecond Commandment as well as the firſt, treats of Religion and our Worſhip of God. The firſt is, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me*, that is to ſay, We ſhall exhibit Religious Worſhip to no other Beings beſides himſelf, and ſo make as if they were Gods. For the all-wiſe God knows there is really no other Gods beſides himſelf, nor any can really make them ſo. But men may make as if there were, by giving Religious Worſhip to them, though they be no Gods. So that here all falſe Deities, whether Angels, *Dæmons*, or ſeparate ſouls of men, or what ever Powers of nature, are plainly forbid to be worſhipped or made Gods of, or acknowledged to be Gods by any Religious Worſhip. Which therefore *à fortiori* takes away all erecting Images to be bowed to or worſhipped in reference to them. In ſo much that the ſecond Commandment ſeems Tautological, or at leaſt ſuperfluous, if it be meerly to forbid the making of Images of Worſhip for thoſe Gods, whoſe at all having, or any way worſhipping is already ſo plainly forbid.

Whence it neceſſarily follows, that at leaſt chiefly, though not onely, the making and worſhipping of Images, in reference to the true God, is forbid by the ſecond Commandment: Whom

the

the Commandment ſtrictly forbids to be worſhipped in any Image whatſoever, that repreſents any thing in the whole Univerſe, Heaven, Earth, or Sea, *&c.* This I ſay, is plainly the principally intended ſenſe, according to free and unprejudiced Reaſon. But yet the Precept is ſo penned, that in a ſecondary ſcope it forbids the Religious bowing to or worſhipping all Images whatſoever. Thus plain is it, that the worſhipping any Images of the true God is here ſtrictly forbidden, contrary to what our Adverſary pretends.

Which Interpretation the Law-giver himſelf, who beſt knows the meaning of his own Laws, do's plainly ratify, *Exod.* 32. where *Iſrael* worſhipping God himſelf in a viſible Image the Golden Calf, provoked Gods wrath ſo as there fell thirty Thouſand of them by the Sword, for ſo hainous a crime of Idolatry. So that the true *Expoſition* of this Law, as *Draco's* Law was ſaid of old to have been, was written in blood. So ſolid and authentick is this ſenſe thereof, namely, That as he will have nothing elſe beſides himſelf worſhipped with Religious Worſhip, ſo himſelf will not be worſhipped in an Image or Similitude of any thing in Heaven, Earth, or Sea, that is, in the whole Univerſe.

But then thirdly out of my Adverſaries own Conceſſion; As it is already manifeſt, that the erection of an Image to the true God is forbidden by this Commandment, ſo is the worſhipping of Images in reference to Saints and Angels here alſo forbidden. For my Adverſary do's readily grant

grant, that the Precept is Moral and strictly binding as to the Prohibition of the Worship of the Images of false Gods. Now I say, There is no more than one God; and the rest no otherwise made Gods than by giving Religious Worship to them, of which erecting consecrated Images to them and bowing to them is one mode. And therefore these Saints and Angels, to whom Religious Worship is given by a Law, do *ipso facto* become Gods, but not true Gods but false Gods; and therefore the worshipping of their Images is forbidden, yea strictly forbidden even in the Moral sense of this Commandment, according to the very concession of my Adversary, whom no man will question in that point to have Pronounced right.

And lastly, That there may be no Creep-hole left, whereas my Adversary would weaken my Argumentations taken from the Morality of the Decalogue in general, and of this Precept in particular, by supposing that I will not stick to grant, that one and the same Precept of the Decalogue (considered under a double respect) may be both Moral and Ceremonial, I do absolutely deny that any Commandment in the substance thereof (and I think I have sufficiently proved it in the third Section of this Chapter) is Ceremonial or Temporal, but of Eternal obligation to the Church of God. As for Example in the fourth Commandment, the substance is the keeping of every seventh day, as an holy Commemoration of the Worlds Creation by God, declared by

by himself, finished in six days space, himself also sanctifying the Seventh day and Hallowing it. So that it seems to me, that every seventh day for a memorial of the Creation, and in such a way as may further our Contemplation in Divine things in reference to God our Creator and Redeemer, is perpetually to be observed. But to keep the self same day with the *Jews* is but Circumstantial, or to keep it in that strict resting, *ab omnimodo opere seculari*, in such a Superstitious way as they do. But now for the second Commandment, if the forbidding of the use of Images by way of Religious Worship, that is by way of bowing to them and worshipping them any how, be not the substance of it, it has no substance at all, but is wholly Ceremonial. Which is very gross and absurd as I have already proved in this Section. So sufficiently firm is our proof from the Morality of the Decalogue, for any thing my Adversary has alledged or can alledge.

For as for his Secondly, That some both Catholick and Protestant Divines own no more than a Ceremonial Precept in this second Commandment, *&c.* I answer, that I think the *Jews* themselves are not really concerned in the Commandment as to the meer making of Images, nor is the Commandment against that, but the making them in reference to Religion and the worshipping of them. This is plainly the scope of the Commandment, as any one that does not wilfully wink cannot but see. And I am confident no Protestant Divine will ever acknowledge, that the Prohibition

hibition of making Images in reference to Religion and the Worship of them, to be meerly Ceremonial in this Precept. He must be a Papist under a Protestants hood that can ever assert this. And this shall serve by way of Reply to what ever is material in his Answer to my second Conclusion.

His Answer to the third Conclusion.

With my third Conclusion he plays at Bo-peep, on this sort, feigning the sense of it to be either this, That we are guilty of Heathenish Idolatry, if we commit Heathenish Idolatry, which he wittily calls an Identick Proposition surfeiting of too much Truth: or else, what ever external Act of Worship was Idolatry in the Heathen, is also Idolatry in us, if applied to any Being on this side God.

The Reply.

To the first I say, That my Conclusion is not an Identick Proposition, because that though the Acts of Idolatry be of the same Nature, yet they are not from the same Party. A *Pagan* worships a Consecrated Image; A *Christian* worships a Consecrated Image; are these two but one Identick Proposition surfeiting of too much Truth? If you espy any overplus, I pray you take it to your self to line your Propositions with, which I usually find too lank and devoid thereof. But it is no vain assertion, nor so plain to every one at the

the first sight: That acts of the same nature committed by several parties, are still of the same nature. For there are some high-flown *Illuminado's*, that hold that lying with another mans wife is not Adultery in them though it be so in others: And I wish it were not so in the Spiritual Adultery, I mean the Idolatry of too many Christians; They do not think they commit it, when the same things done by Heathen they will readily acknowledge to be Idolatry.

But now to the second part, I answer, That I do not restrain Idolatry in this place to External acts of Worship onely; but it comprehends any External, Internal, or mixt act consisting of both, which are held Idolatrous in the Heathen. Which quite breaks in pieces the insnaring case my Adversary offers to me; of a converted Christian begging St. *Pauls* blessing on the knee as his father that begat him in Christ; and of an Heathen of *Lycaonia* on his knees adoring the Apostle at the same time for the God *Mercury*, *Act.* 14. For every External act of Worship is not Idolatry. Nor was it Idolatry in the *Lycaonian* to be on his knee to *Paul*, but the intended adoration of him for the God *Mercury*. This mixt action of genuflexion and Internal Religious adoration together was Idolatry, but the External alone had not been Idolatry. And if the new Convert had given inward Religious Worship adjoyned to the External genuflection unto St. *Paul*, then it had been Idolatry in him also as well in the *Lycaonian*. So little hurt has this assault done my third Conclu-

sion, which is not restrained to External acts of Worship, but asserts onely, All acts of Worship, Internal, External or mixt, that are Idolatrous in Heathens, to be so also in Christians when they commit the like.

Answer to the fourth Conclusion.

In his Answer to my fourth Conclusion he hales in Prepostrously my eight Conclusion out of time and order, and so confusedly speaks to them both. But I am such a lover of Method, that I will onely reply to what belongs to my fourth Conclusion here, and defer the answering to what is mentioned under my eighth Conclusion till we come thither. What therefore he Objects against my fourth Conclusion is onely this: First that it is proofless and false that the Pagans *worshipped the supreme God in an Image. Secondly, that I omitted one branch of the* Pagan *Idolatry, the worshipping of the very Images for Gods. They called them Gods, sayes he, they took them for Gods, sacrificed to them as Gods. And the same is to be said of those souls of men departed,* Dæmons *or other particular Appearances or Powers of Nature, all which they took and worshipped for Gods, For Gods I say, which this mincing Conclusion seeks most warily to conceal. This is the utmost of the force my Adversary summes up against this Conclusion.*

The

The Reply.

To the first thing Objected I answer: That he must understand by his Assertion either, That the *Pagans* had not the knowledge of the supreme God, and so could not Worship him at all, and consequently not in an Image; or else that having the knowledge of the supreme God yet they did not Worship him in an Image. If he means the first it is a notorious untruth, as may easily appear out of *Plato*, *Plutarch*, *Aristotle*, *Homer*, *Tully*, *Plotinus*, *Jamblichus*, and many other of the Heathen Writers, who were clear asserters of the supreme Godhead, and many of them notable skilfull describers of the same. This is a thing so well known among the learned, that it is enough to mention it onely. But if he mean the second, that is also a mistake. For the Inhabitants of *Thebais* worshipped the maker of the World, in the Image of a man with an egg coming out of his mouth. *Dion Chrysostomus* also, and *Maximus Tyrius* do profess, that in their Images of Gold and Silver and Ivory, they worshipped the supreme God the maker and Governour of all things. And what was more frequent than the Images of *Jupiter*, who is the supreme Deity; whom *Aratus* invokes in his *Phanomena*, and St. *Paul* speaking of the supreme God, (*Acts* 17.28.) *In whom we live and move and have our being*, alledges out of *Aratus* in that very place, these words of his,

Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν --------

For we are his off-spring, namely τοῦ Διὸς of *Jupiter*, and *Theon* the Scholiast on the place, Διὰ τοῦ νῦν τὸν δημιουργὸν ἀκουστέον. *We must understand*, saith he, *here by* Jupiter *the maker of the World*. So that that part of the Heathenish Idolatry is plain, that they worshipped the supreme God in an Image: But suppose they did not, were it not then a shame, that the Church of *Rome* should be greater Idolaters than they, that stick not to Worship the supreme God in an Image, and a shame for my Adversary who contends, that the worshipping of the true God by an Image is not forbidden in the second Commandment; and so proves himself a patron for greater Idolatry than he acknowledges to be among the very Heathen.

To the second thing Objected, I answer, That I might very well omit that branch of Idolatry, the worshipping of their very Images for Gods, because I did not intend any such charge upon you, as if you worshipped Images taking them for the very Saints or Angels themselves, because I hope that seldom happens even amongst the most ignorant of your *Plebeians*; as I believe it very seldom happened amongst the Heathens themselves. And the force of my arguing from this fourth Conclusion will never lye upon the plenary enumeration of all the sorts of *Pagan* Idolatry, but on my true application to those that are mentioned

mentioned there. So be they be there I refer to in my Arguments, it is enough; others not being there, or there being more than I refer to, neither ſtrengthen nor weaken my Applications and Arguings, ſo framed as I have intimated.

So that it is a ſuperfluous thing for me to go about to diſprove your Aſſertion, That they called their Images Gods, that they took them for Gods, that they ſacrificed to them as Gods; Onely I ſhall return thus much, That *Dan.* 5. 4. do's not prove that they themſelves called their Images Gods, but that the Holy Penman ſtyleth them ſo. As the Spirit of Truth alſo ſtiles them, or rather ſtiles their Gods Images, which is all one. *Iſa.* 46. *Pſal.* 115. *Habac.* 2. *Act.* 19. 26. the very places you quote to prove they took their Images for Gods. Which places yet do not at all prove it, but onely prove what the ſentence of the true God is, touching the Gods of the Heathen, in reference to their Images they worſhipped complexly with them, upon a ſuppoſal that upon their Conſecration, ſome inviſible Power was conveyed into them, and was ready there to hear and help all ſupplicants to them. But now God who is the Prince and Commander of all Spirits knows, that this their Religious Conſecration has no ſuch Power to convey any ſuch aſſiſting Spirits unto thoſe Images, ſo that they may be aſſured of their preſence and ayd, and therefore he muſt juſtly and truly, contrary to their opinion of them, who took them to be inhabited by ſome *Daemon*, calls them meer ſtocks and

ſtones as they really are. But to take the meer ſtock or ſtone which they ſaw hewed into ſuch a forme to be a God, is ſo exceſſively ſottiſh, that it is not credible, that it ever fell into the mind of any number of the loweſt dregs of the Heathen Common People, or that they intended their ſacrifices to them. But that they phancyed the preſence of ſome *Dæmons* that received the Nidour and Odour of their Sacrifices, is a thing ſo Vulgar and Trite, that I hold it needleſs any more than to mention it.

And now whereas he ſaith, That the ſouls of men departed, their *Dæmons*, and particular Powers and Appearances of Nature they took them, and worſhipped them for Gods, and calls my Concluſion a mincing Concluſion, becauſe it do's not mention that? This omiſſion was no intended cunning of mine to ruine the matter at all. For I thought I ſpoke ſufficiently home in ſaying they gave Religious Worſhip to theſe, which is at leaſt equal to the calling of them Gods, eſpecially in Greek and Latine. For as much as θεοὶ and *Dii* in the Greek and Latine ſignify as large as *Elohim* in the Hebrew which ſignifyes Angels or particular Spirits as well as the eternal God the maker and Governour of all. And ſo does θεοὶ and *Dii* ſignify all inviſible Spirits, δαίμονες particularly ſeparate ſouls from δαίω to divide or ſeparate, becauſe they are ſeparate from the Terreſtrial body. And θεὸς alſo is ſaid of a ſeparate ſoul amongſt the Pythagoreans; and *Syneſius* himſelf alſo ſays, Θεὸς ἐν θεοῖς χορεύσω,

That

That he would be an Angel or a blessed Spirit amongst the blessed Spirits. Wherefore *Dii*, θεοὶ δαίμονες, which we usually translate Gods, the words of themselves imply no more than Angels or souls separate. But if Religious Worship be given to them, then they become Gods: Nor can any thing beside the supreme God be properly called God, unless Religious Worship be instituted for it; and then be it what it will, the Notion and name of a false God properly belongs unto it: so that in reality in saying, They give Religious Worship to the souls of men, or *Dæmons*; I say also, That they were their Gods, and that they worshipped them for such; So that my Adversary has what he would, and yet my Conclusion remains as strong as ever. But in the mean time let me Observe, That the calling of the Canonized souls of Holy men ἅγιοι, (and Saints answers to it, and consequentially is of the same sense so far forth as it respects their Canonization) from the propriety of notation from ἅγιος, whence is ἁγίζειν, and ἁγιστία, which implies Religious Worship, is the calling of them by an higher Title than if they should call them θεοὶ. So little mincing is there in the application of *Saints*, from that of *Gods* signifying in the same latitude that θεοὶ. But *Saints* as it signifies onely Pious or Holy, there sounds nothing amiss in it.

Anſwer to the fifth Concluſion.

All the Anſwer, ſaith he, That truth can allow to this fifth Concluſion, is Nego ſuppoſitum; *For the Doctor here ſuppoſeth, that he hath given us a true and adequate diviſion of the* Pagan *Idolatry in the precedent Concluſion, according to Divine declaration and the common conſent of Chriſtendom; whereas I have ſhewed his* Hypotheſis *to be falſe, and laid open his foul and groſs miſtakes, ('tis a favour to call them ſo) which indeed are ſuch as might invite a modeſt man to wipe his pen and lay it aſide, till he had taught it a more awful regard to Ingenuity and Truth.* This is his whole Anſwer *Verbatim.*

The Reply.

Upon which truely I have much ado to forbear from more than ſmiling, to obſerve the art of my Adverſary in making the greateſt noiſe and boaſt where there is leaſt of all at the bottom; he ſpeaking ſuch a perfect nothing with ſo great a grace. If he has ſhewed any *Hypotheſis* to be falſe, it muſt be an *Hypotheſis* of his own making. For I did not, nor do ſuppoſe my fourth Concluſion to be an adequate enumeration of all the Idolatries of the *Pagans*, but onely as many as I have enumerated to be real Paganical Idolatries; which my Adverſary himſelf cannot deny. And I intended no more than thus, nor is any more than

than thus serviceable to my design: For I shall not refer to that Conclusion for any more modes of Idolatry than are mentioned there. Nor does this fifth Conclusion pronounce of any more than are there mentioned. So that this Conclusion is as firme as a Rock of Marble. Let any man therefore consider his long flourish at the end of this Answer, and he will observe what an excellent Artist my Adversary is, in making a show of saying something, when the matter do's not afford any thing to be said. But such sleights serve to keep the people in their bondage of Errour. And yet he wipes his mouth, who ever should wipe their pen; and presumes he has done nothing amiss, it being in so Pious a Cause, and for the Interest of his Church. For I must confess, I think it impossible but himself should here clearly discern, that he says nothing at all to the purpose.

Answer to the sixth Conclusion.

This sixth Conclusion, says he, looks back upon the fifth, and calls to it for help; but till the fifth has learned to stand upon its own legs, it is not in a condition to lend any proof or support to its neighbours. This to the sixth Conclusion as demonstrated from the fifth. But my Adversary is very pleasant upon the Confirmation annexed thereto, of which I shall give a taste in my Reply.

The

The Reply.

I appeal to the Reader, If the fifth doth not ſtand very faſt and unmoveable for any thing my Adverſary hath brought againſt it, or indeed can be brought againſt it. To make a ſhow of undermining it, he feigned a falſe *Hypotheſis* of his own, which he would have faſtened upon me, as if I had need of it, when as I have moſt manifeſtly proved to the contrary: So that this ſixth Concluſion alſo is as firme as need be deſired. But he aſſaults the further Confirmation of it, (which I added *ex abundanti*) with a pleaſant freak fetched out of *Euſebius*, his mentioning of thirty Thouſand Deities of the Heathens reckoned by *Heſiod*, which he brings in a Maurice dance againſt my Confirmation to make it Ridiculous; nay many more Gods of wood and ſtone noted by *Euſebius* himſelf, he like a ſecond *Amphion* makes to dance after his pipe; but all his Muſick is ſpoiled by my freely acknowledging, that by ſome *inferiour helpfull Being*: I underſtand ſuch a Being as he may if he will call an inferiour Deity; and is ſo in as good a ſenſe as any can be upon the ſuppoſal I mean; namely, that Religious Worſhip is given to it. So that the uncertainty of the ſenſe of that phraſe ſhall be no matter for his Antick Sophiſtry, or Diſtorted Raillery. But in the mean time, this numerous rabble of inferiour Deities he has conjured up, I ſhall make diſcharge their force againſt himſelf, illuſtrating the ſtrength of my Confirmation from hence,

viz.

viz. That if the giving Religious Worſhip to what is not the ſupreme God, though not as to him but as to ſome inferiour helpfull Being, which they judge worthy of Religious Worſhip, and ſo make an inferiour Deity of it, be not Idolatry; the *Pagans*, who as my Adverſary affirms out of *Euſebius* worſhipped thirty Thouſand ſuch like Deities and more, were ſeldom or never to be found Idolaters; which I think is abſurdity enough. So little has my Adverſary got, by attempting to raiſe a diſjunctive Quibble out of that ancient Father of the Church *Euſebius*, to blind the eyes of the Populacy.

Anſwer to the ſeventh Concluſion.

In Anſwer to this ſeventh Concluſion, he firſt Propoſes ſome things as Preparatory thereto. Afterwards, he brings in the Anſwer it ſelf. The Preparatories *are theſe*

I. *That Catholicks uſually diſtinguiſh two parts of Worſhip. The firſt* Latria *which is the higheſt Religious Worſhip poſſible, due to God alone the Creatour of all Things, and that Examples of this kind of Worſhip are, Sacrifices, and the erecting of Temples and Altars.*

II. *That neither Sacrifice it ſelf, nor dedication of Temples and Altars excludes a ſecondary Remembrance, or Titular honour of Saints.*

III. *That there are other Acts of an inferiour reſpect which without any offence to the Catholick Divinity, we may chuſe whether we will call Religious*

ligious worship or no, as burning Incense, lighting up Candles, and bowing our bodies to the Saints and their Images. These Acts he calls indifferent and variously determinable according to our intention to either a Divine or Civil Worship. As was Abrahams *incurvation of his body to God,* Gen. 17. *to Angels,* Gen. 18. *to Men,* Gen. 23. *This is the sum of the force and strength of his* Preparatories.

The main strength of his Answer it self, is contained in these few things; namely, That all my Instances of Idolatry in this seventh Conclusion are not true Instances of Idolatry, but that I do as unskilfully, as if a Lawyer should define murther to be the wilfull taking away a mans life without cause, or cutting a limb or drawing of blood. So saith he, sacrificing to an Image and bowing to an Image sutes not well together, as if they were both Acts of Idolatry, any more than all those are of Murther. His great exception therefore against this seventh Conclusion is, that I make bowing to an Image Idolatry, which he indeavours to disprove.

First from the Jews *bowing towards the Ark of the Covenant, over which were the Cherubims of Image work; which, says he, could not be done without bowing before Images. Secondly, from* Christians *bowing at the name of Jesus. Thirdly and lastly he adds, That the Worship done to their Saints and Images, is not by the Catholick Church commanded to be called Religious Worship, which he applies to the proof of my seventh Conclusion. This is the main of what he brings*

against

against this seventh Conclusion: For it were tedious to take notice of what things are so little pertinent to the purpose, but onely brought in for a blind to the people. And I have neither leasure nor any list to meddle with such things. In which notwithstanding I acknowledge my Adversary an Egregious Artist for the imposing on poor Souls to use his own Phrase.

The Reply.

As to the first of his Preparatories, that tells us Catholicks usually distinguish two sorts of Worship; I wonder then that he has so soon forgot to be a Catholick himself, as to assert there are three; from that Instance of *Abrahams* bowing to God, to Angels, and to Men, by a different Application of the heart, *viz.* to be Divine Worship in respect of God, an inferiour kind of Worship in respect of Angels, and a Civil Worship as referred to men. "Wherefore, *says he*, he that "would speak distinctly to the Catholick Tenet, "must distinguish these several modes of Wor-"ship one from another, or else shew cause why "he ranks them all under one and the same species "of Religious Worship, else he will not Cope "with his Adversary like a Scholar. Namely, Unless contrary to the current of Catholicks he make three kind of Worships instead of two, or take not heed of making all three one kind of Worship, that is, Religious; which is impossible for any one to do that is not a meer dotard.

So

So perplextly and confoundedly does he ſpeak of his ſorts of Worſhip by reaſon of the tenderneſs and unſoundneſs of the cauſe he undertakes.

But if he would make any ſenſe of the two ſorts of Worſhip uſually diſtinguiſhed by the Catholicks, he muſt either underſtand that general bipartition of Worſhip into Religious and Civil. Or elſe that bipartition of Religious Worſhip into *Latria* and *Dulia*, which later may again be ſubdivided into *Dulia major* or *minor*; *Major* that which is given to the bleſſed Virgin, and is particularly called *Hyperdulia*; *Minor*, that to the reſt of the Saints and their Images. But this he durſt not ſpeak out explicitly, that he might not be found to allow Religious Incurvation to Images, which is ſo manifeſtly forbidden in the ſecond Commandment, as is intimated in this ſeventh Concluſion.

Now to his ſecond Preparatory, That neither Sacrifice it ſelf, nor Dedication of Temples and Altars, which he ſays are Acts of *Latria*, excludes a ſecundary Remembrance or titular Honour of the Saints; I ſay, as it is little to the preſent Concluſion, ſo it is in it ſelf plainly falſe; For it is expreſly ſaid, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods beſides me.* And God himſelf knows, and God be thanked we all know, that it impoſſible there ſhould be any Gods beſides Him, and that therefore we can have none but Him in any other ſenſe than in doing ſome actions in honour to that which is not God, which is proper to be done to God alone.

alone. And therefore to make any Thing or Person to Communicate with God in these actions of honour, is to have other Gods besides Him, as much as it is possible to have any other.

Nor will it excuse the fact, that this honour is but secundarily intended to the Saints, or what ever else is thus worshipped besides God. For besides, that the direction of our intention will not change the nature of the proper Notes of an external *Latria*, these can be no other than secondary Deities which are forbidden; for as much as there can be no other but these besides him to be forbid, and therefore no other than a secundary Honour or inferiour kind of Religious Worship can be possibly intended to them, by those that institute it or do it to them; they retaining as the *Jews* did, the supreme God still for their God; and therefore even that honour is also forbidden, in that it is forbidden that we should have any Gods besides Jehovah himself. And besides, can he that is a jealous God endure that any other should any ways partake of that honour that is proper to Him even of *Latria*, which these Acts are acknowledged to be by my Adversary; whose insensibility therefore I stand amazed at in this point. For he flatly affirms this to be warrantable Religion, *viz.* That this Temple and this Altar be erected and dedicated to God and St. *Francis*; That this or that Sacrifice be offered to God and St. *Francis*; To God primarily as the supreme God, to St. *Francis* secundarily

rily or as to a Saint, not as to the ſupreme God. But does not Temples, Altars and Sacrifices, make a ſecundary or inferiour Deity, as much as any Thing or Perſon can be made a Deity, by them that hold one ſupreme God; which was the caſe of the *Jews*. And therefore thus having or making a ſecundary Deity is palpable Idolatry.

To the third Preparatory, I Anſwer, firſt, That it is hard to conceive, that we may chooſe whether we will call theſe acts of inferiour reſpect Religious or no, without any offence to his Catholick Divinity; when as the Catholicks, as he calls them, diſtinguiſhing two ſorts of Worſhip, it is neceſſary to make ſuch bipartitions of them as I have hinted; if they will have them run by twos, which will empty theſe acts of inferiour reſpect, as he Termes them, to be Religious; and himſelf plainly intimates they are ſo toward the end of his Anſwer to this ſeventh Concluſion. For he ſays, "But if nothing will ſerve "my turn, but Religious and Divine Worſhip "muſt be all one, then we utterly deny that we "are in any wiſe concerned in his Objection, for "we give no ſuch Religious Worſhip to the Saints "themſelves much leſs to their Images; that is, no ſuch Religious Worſhip as is Divine and is properly *Latria*; but it implies, that an inferiour Religious VVorſhip you do give; nor do I contend for a *Latria*, but Religious VVorſhip in general.

Secondly, I deny that burning Incenſe, lighting up Candles, bowing our bodies to Saints and

and their Images are acts indifferent, determinable as our intention ſhall be to either a Divine or Civil VVorſhip, as *Abrahams* incurvation of his body to God, to Angels, to Men; For bowing the body is a vulgar Ceremony of Civility, known up and down in the VVorld to be ſo; and does not become a Religious Ceremony, till it be applied to an Object of Religious VVorſhip, or in ſuch circumſtances that it is underſtood to be ſo: but the bowing the body to the conſecrated Image of ſome inviſible Power or Spirit, is as notoriouſly all over the VVorld known to be a Religious Ceremony, and to ſignify Religious Honour and VVorſhip. And we may as well, or rather better, call the Saints Gods, and pretend onely a Civil ſenſe by it, as bow to the Image of a Saint ſet up and Conſecrated for the purpoſe, and pretend we intend onely a Civil VVorſhip by it. For this was the Univerſal Mode of acknowledging any perſon a God, by erecting an Image, and Honouring him in it by the above ſaid Ceremony; as it was the Univerſal Phraſe of calling that a God which was ſo honoured. And what is ſaid of bowing the body to the conſecrate Image of an Inviſible Power or Spirit, the ſame is alſo to be ſaid of lighting Candels before the ſaid Image; it is an Univerſally well known Ceremony of Religion amongſt the Nations, not a Civil Ceremony, whereby they acknowledged that to be a God whom they ſo Honoured. And laſtly for burning of Incenſe, the learned are agreed, that it is a Sacrifice, and

therefore an act of *Latria* according to my Adversaries own Concession. And the Primitive Christians were so sensible thereof, that they would rather die than fling a few grains of Incense into the fire in honour of the Emperour, they looking upon it as a Sacrificing to him. And truly it is a very noble kind of Sacrifice, as may be seen by the Altar of Incense next the Holy of Holies, and highly significant of Honour; that is, of sending up prayers, and Devotionally spending all the Powers of our Souls and bodies as an acceptable service, and of a sweet smelling savour to him we thus Worship: Which is the highest Worship imaginable, so far is it from being determinable to a Civil Worship, I mean the Type thereof, from either custom or the nature of the thing it self.

Its Preparatories being thus swept away, let us consider the Answer it self: In which he lays to my charge, what himself was just now so manifestly guilty of, namely of mingling things of an Heterogeneous nature, he making the burning of Incense to a Saint, which is a Sacrifice, a Civil Worship, as well as the bowing of the body. And he blames me for making, Sacrificeing to an Image, and bowing to an Image, both of them acts of Idolatry. Whenas notwithstanding, I do not say, that simply bowing towards an Image, suppose to take up a pin, or a glove, from off the the flour betwixt the Image and us, is Idolatry, but a Religious Incurvation to the Image is Idolatry. So that my Adversary is disingenuous in not

not representing my Assertion such as it is, which addes Religious to that bowing or Incurvation to an Image which I pronounce to be Idolatry. And all Incurvation is such, that is made to a consecrated Image, as to an Object of this Worship.

I but he has two proofs to evince, that even Religious Incurvation to an Image is no Idolatry. For the name of Jesus is Religiously bowed to, and the Jews were commanded to bow toward the Ark of the Covenant over which were the Cherubims of Image-work. And therefore they were commanded to bow to Images by God himself, which therefore can be no Idolatry.

To the first I answer, That a name or voice is no Image or Similitude, accordingly as it is written, *Deut.* 4. 12. ye saw no Similitude, onely ye heard a voice. And besides it is ridiculous to infer, that we bow to the name of Jesus when we hear it named, because we bow at the naming of it, as to infer that those of your Church say their *Ave-Maries* to the *Ave-Mary-bell*, because they say them at the tinkling of it; neither the *Ave-Mary-bell*, nor the Name or word Jesus are the Objects of our Devotion, but onely the Occasions of it. Besides, they whose backs are turned off the Priests or Reader when he names the name of Jesus, what a ridiculous bowing were that in them, if they bowed to the name sounding behind them. Therefore these are poor and weak shifts to make a show for the worshipping of Images, from an Example where there is nei-

ther any Image, nor any bowing to that which they would fain fancy to be one.

To the second I Answer, That be it so that there is a command to bow toward the Ark of the Covenant where Images are, and consequentially towards Images; and that this Incurvation is Religious, yet the command to bow toward these Images is onely *ex accidenti*: And mark the cunning of my Adversary here again, (my words are, *or make any Religious Obeisance, or Incurvation to an Image in any wise, as to an Object of this Worship*) which last words he craftily leaves out; Which are of Essential importance to this act of Idolatry. But God was so far from commanding the Jews to bow towards the Cherubims, as to an Object of their Worship, that he barred them from the very sight of them, and suffered them not so much as to be an object of their eyes. Which was a plain inhibition from bowing to them, as an Object of their Devotion, or any way of worshipping them. It would be a very unjust imputation of any rash tongue, touching suppose some chast *Amazon*, that she was familiarly saluted by such a Knight at such a time, when she did not so much as lift up the Beaver of her Helmet all the time they conversed together, which therefore was a certain bar against any such audacious attempt. And the Case is the same in this foul charge, that God commanded the Jews to Worship the Cherubims over the Mercy seat, and bow to them as an object; when as he carefully hid them with a vail from their eyes, that they might not be worshipped.

ped. Besides how infinitely inconsistent is it with the Truth and Sanctity of the Divine Majesty, to give so strict a Law against worshipping of Images, and then at the same time to command the two Cherubims to be worshipped, and yet to take away the lives of thirty Thousand men for worshipping that golden Cherub, or golden Calf which *Aaron* had set up: Which being in their view and they bowing before, became the object of their Worship. But the Cherubims on the Ark of the Covenant were onely a Circumstance of their Worship as so much, but were industriously hid from being any Object thereof. And God alone who spake from betwixt the Cherubims, was the onely object of their Worship: And the Cherubims and other Holy things there were onely Holy figures and Hieroglyphicks of mysterious and profound Truths, which here it is not at all necessary to explain.

And now lastly touching his last shift, concerning the nature of this Worship of Images and Saints; which insinuates, that though there be a middle Worship betwixt Divine and Civil, the Catholick Church (he means the *Roman*) does not require that it should be called Religious; besides that it is contrary to the common stream of Catholicks as I noted before, and that he himself does imply that middle Worship to be Religious; I add further, what are we the better for not calling it Religious, when it is so in its own nature, and we thereby Idolaters? Now is it in our Power to make this middle Worship of Saints

expreſſed by conſecrated Images, and bowing to them to be a Civil Worſhip. For the Almighty Law-giver is afore hand with us in this, who has forbidden us to have any other Gods beſides himſelf. And in the ſecond Commandment as he has forbidden that himſelf ſhould be worſhipped by any graven Image, *Deut.* 4. *v.* 12. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. ſo by vertue of the firſt Commandment he has alſo forbid us to erect, or conſecrate, or any ways to make any Image to any one elſe, and to bow to it in honour of the Perſon it is made to, it being the known and uſual way of making a falſe Deity; a falſe or inferiour Deity being nothing elſe but ſome Creature, (for there cannot be poſſibly any more than one real God) that by erecting an Image to it, and by bowing to this Image, or any otherwiſe worſhipping it, or honouring it, in reference to that Creature, as by burning Incenſe before it, and making Invocations looking up to it, is made a God. VVhich therefore is forbid by this firſt and ſecond Commandment as a Religious, that is to ſay, as a wickedly Religious or Idolatrous VVorſhip, whether to God or to any thing elſe; but is not in any wiſe a Civil VVorſhip, it being thus branded by God for an Idolatrous one, and declared to be a Mode of Religious VVorſhip, though a bad one, as I have noted in this Concluſion. Nor is there any legitimate Religious VVorſhip, but what is truly Divine, and is done to God himſelf. VVhat ever comes after this, it is but ſeveral degrees of Civil VVorſhip, whether to Men or to Angels, namely

namely when they are visible to us. But to VVorship an Angel no way sensible, nor visible to us is an act of Idolatry, as is else where proved. In the mean time we sufficiently see how weak all the attempts of my Adversary are against this seventh Conclusion.

Answer to the eighth Conclusion.

This Conclusion for its proof appeals to the Testimony of four false witnesses; to wit, the third, fourth, fifth and sixth Conclusions, and as such I justly except against them. This is his whole Answer to the eighth.

The Reply.

But now I desire the Reader to examine those four witnesses as he calls them, and consider how clear and unexceptionable a witness they give; And to perpend my Reply to his Objections against them, that he may see what exceeding firm and evident Truths they witness too, and such as no man of ordinary wit and Conscience, if he impartially consider them, can possibly deny. And to note also, that from my Adversaries own Concession, if those four Conclusions be true, this Conclusion must be true also.

But that there may be no room left for further Cavilling, I will according to my Promise in my Reply to his Objections against my fourth Con-

cluſion, anſwer to his exceptions there prepoſterouſly made againſt a ſpecial Clauſe annexed to this eighth, *viz.* *That the Pagans* Dæmons, *exquiſitely anſwer to the Chriſtians Saints and Angels in this point; ſaving that this Spiritual Fornication is a rape upon our Saints and Angels, but ſingle Fornication in the Heathen with their impure* Dæmons. Touching this particular Clauſe ſays my Adverſary, *pag.* 12, Of all the Doctors Concluſions, there is none more intrinſick and Fundamental to the Subject now under debate, nor any that ought to ſpeak more, or doth ſpeak leſs to the point than this; For it is moſt fondly Erroneous, and moſt diſingenuouſly obtruded upon the eaſy credulity of the Vulgar; that the Pagans *Dæmons* exquiſitely anſwer to the Chriſtians Saints and Angels, So he: But this is onely to make a noiſe *ad populum.* For what I affirm is moſt apparently true, *viz.* That the Pagans *Dæmons* exquiſitely anſwer to the Chriſtians Saints and Angels in this point here mentioned, in having the like Idolatrous Worſhip done to them. For my Concluſion ſays [in this Point] which he craftily and according to his cuſtom leaves out; but the Point is eaſily proved. For had the *Dæmons* of the Pagans Temples Conſecrated to them? So have the Saints; Had they Altars built to them? So have the Saints; Had they Images erected to them? So have the Saints; Did they burn Incenſe to the *Dæmons*? So they do to the Saints; Were the *Dæmons* invoked before their Images? So are the Saints; Did they make Vows to the *Dæmons*? So they

they do to the Saints. And is not this ſimilitude exact enough for my purpoſe, who intimate onely, that thoſe things are done to Saints that were done to the Pagans *Dæmons*; and that therefore thoſe four Concluſions are rightly alledged to prove the eighth. But whereas my Adverſary makes a noiſe, as if this Clauſe were the moſt Intrinſick and Fundamental to the whole buſineſs, it is ſo little eſſential to the matter, that if I had not mentioned it, my Cauſe had been alike ſtrong without it; and my Reader by caſting his eye on this Concluſion, and the Concluſions here cited, might have obſerved as much as I have ſaid, of himſelf, ſo obvious is the Truth thereof. But taking this Clauſe abſolutely as my Antagoniſt has quoted it, there might abundance more ſimilitudes betwixt the Pagans *Dæmons*, and the Pontifician Saints be enumerated out of the 17. *Chap.* of the firſt book of my *Synopſis Prophetica*, which for brevity ſake I omit.

The greateſt Objection my Adverſary brings againſt this Aſſertion is, That the Saints are not called Gods, as the *Dæmons* of the Pagans were; *Can any ſober Divinity*, ſays he, *brook it*, (pag. 15.) *that the Pagans* Dæmons *ſhould be ſaid exquiſitely to anſwer to our Saints and Angels. Do we Worſhip Saints and Angels for Gods? Do we call them Gods? Do we take them for Gods? Do we Sacrifice to them as Gods?* Far be it as from our heart to intend it ſo from an ingenuous Adverſary to Object it. But I ſay, though you do not Sacrifice Oxen to the Saints, yet you burn Incenſe to them, which was a very

a very high and Holy Sacrifice under *Moses*. But the great ſtreſs lyes in this, that you do not call them Gods. But what's that to the purpoſe while you make them ſo; doing in a manner all the Religious Ceremonies that the Pagans did to their Gods: And for the very Name in your Latine Authours, how much does *Divus Paulus*, and *Divus Thomas*, differ from *Deus Paulus*, and *Deus Thomas*; which yet is uſuall enough.

Nec tam præſentes alibi cognoſcere Divos.

But we will not inſiſt on Grammatical Niceties: Admit they are not called Gods, (not to note that ἅγιοι ſignifies at leaſt as high) does it follow you do not make them ſo. Let us frame this ſhort Parable fitted for the meaneſt Capacity.

A City ſuppoſe, for a certain time was ſo inſtituted, that Whores and Whoredom, under that very Name and Appellation was admitted as Lawfull; but there being ſome ill conſequences of it, and inconvenient for the Common Weal of the City, this Licentiouſneſs was aboliſhed, and the City reduced to a more ſober paſs. But after ſome time the ſame cuſtom got up again, and was ratified by Law, but under another Title; calling thoſe that were termed Whores before, Nymphs of Pleaſure, and Whoredom, the doing duty and ſervice to the Nymphs of Pleaſure. Thus having continued for a ſeaſon, a certain plain-hearted, and plain-ſpoken Citizen, obſerving the ſame inconveniences return that were before,

ſtood

stood up in the Senate, and spake out his mind concerning this custom; openly declaring, that the old Whoredom was returned again, which they had upon good grounds abolished out of the City: Whereupon a Zealous Oratour of the other Party stands up and cries out: Can any sober Politicks brook such a reproach as this to so well governed a City, as to condemn it of approving Whoredom, for allowing men to do duty and service to the Nymphs of Pleasure? Where are the Whores that this licensed Whoredom is committed with? Do we caress or accost these Nymphs of Pleasure as Whores? Do we call them Whores? Do we take them for Whores? Do we lye with them as Whores? Far be it, as from our hearts to intend it, so from any ingenuous and well-bred Citizen to Object it. Was not this a very smooth and convincing speech to wipe the City clean off the Imputation of VVhoredom? But this honest blunt Citizen briefly replied: That in lying with these Nymphs of Pleasure, they *ipso facto* made them VVhores; which was an Answer never to be refuted. And to say I to my right fluent and eloquent Adversary, and to his vehement Rhetorick so like that of this Oratour in the Parable. That by erecting Temples, Altars and Images, by invoking and making vows to Saints and Angels, they make them Gods whether they will or no, as much as any thing can be made a God by men.

So that the Pagans *Dæmons* do exquisitely answer to the Christians Saints and Angels in this point

point of Idolatry; saving that this Spiritual Fornication is a Rape upon our Saints and Angels, but simple Fornication in the Heathen with their impure *Dæmons*. Nor is it any immodesty in any one to use such similitudes as the Spirit of God has used before us, who frequently sets out Idolatry by Fornication. Whence it will follow by clean and dry Mathematical Analogy, that Idolatry committed upon an unwilling Object is a Rape, and that the Saints and Angels are unwilling thus to be abused, any one may adventure to be their compurgator. VVhence the Idolatry committed is more hainous, as a Rape is a more hainous sin than simple fornication. This is therefore truly that blaspheming of them that dwell in Heaven, the Saints and Angels, *Apoc.* 13. 6. namely by this Idolatrous VVorship done to them, traducing them as if they were pleased thus to be made false Gods by receiving Religious VVorship, and were open Rebells against the true. But we will dwell no longer on this Subject; It is already sufficiently manifest that not onely this eight Conclusion, but also this superadded Clause annexed to it, is without exception.

Answer to the ninth Conclusion.

This Conclusion having thus coldly drawn up an enditement against us, pleads its evidence out of the seventh and eighth Conclusions; And so leaning upon two broken Reeds falls to the ground, where I am sure neither Reason nor Authority will ever stoop to take them up.

The

The Reply.

This is all he returns to my ninth Conclusion, which is just nothing at all. For I have abundantly evinced that my seventh and eighth Conclusions are no broken Reeds, but invincible and immovable Pillars of Truth; which Reason will never suffer to fall to the ground, nor any understanding Authority ever gain-say.

Answer to the tenth Conclusion.

Here asking leave first of Ethicks *he tells my Conclusion, that it gives God the lye, and makes him the Approver, Commander, and Rewarder of Sin, even Idolatry it self. For God promised a reward to Prayer made in the Temple,* 2 Chron. 7. 15. *where notwithstanding there were graved Angels or Cherubims upon the walls. And he commanded his people to adore the Ark over which were Cherubims or Angels of Image-work; where the worshipper could not possibly make his addresses, but he must needs bow at least Circumstantially if not Objectively towards an Image, which he says I make Idolatry. This is the sum of what he alledges against this tenth Conclusion.*

The Reply.

To which I reply, That he would have done well tohave beg'd pardon of *Grammar, Rhetorick,* and

and *Logick* too, as well as of *Ethicks*; For he has offended againſt all four. To give God the lye is no ſuch Rhetorical flouriſh, though he uſes it more than once in his Anſwer to this Concluſion, as if he were in love with the phraſe. Nor has it that Grammatical ſence he would put on it; For to give the lye is to ſay one ſpeaks falſe, not to ſpeak falſe of another; That is to be lye one. Beſides to adore the Ark that is not good Grammar, *Pſal.* 99 5. It is השתחוו להדם VVorſhip at his foot-ſtool. And the ſeventy has it, προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ, where ᾧ ὑποποδίῳ in προσκυνεῖτε has the ſame force that ל in להדם. And it is laſtly very bad Logick to argue, That becauſe I ſay, in a Country where men profeſſedly VVorſhip an Image as an Object, if another bow to the ſame Image, with an Intention onely of making it a circumſtance of his Worſhip commits Idolatry; that therefore I ſay, that al bowings before an Image, though onely circumſtantially, is Idolatry. For this is to conclude a general from a particular, which is enormous bad *Logick:* As ill as if he ſhould conclude, that becauſe one ſays, that putting the Hat off in *Turky* is a reproach; therefore he ſays, the putting the Hat off any where is a reproach. Wherefore I do not make God an approver or rewarder of Idolatry, ſince I do not affirm circumſtantially to bow towards an Image to be Idolatry, unleſs in a Country where the people do objectively bow to it; which was not the caſe of the Jews, as I have ſufficiently proved above.

There are ſome little nibblings and quibblings at

at my Tranſition which concludes this firſt *Chapter*, which I permit my Adverſary to pleaſe himſelf in, it being paſt that time of the day with me. It is ſufficient that I have ſhew'd, that my ten Concluſions of this firſt *Chapter* have prov'd themſelves as firm as Adamant againſt all the aſſaults of my Adverſary. And as for his nibbling at my Tranſition to build a jeſt upon, if he had rather have Divine *definition* or *declaration*, than *definitions* or *declarations*, let him pleaſe himſelf. But the grounds of my Concluſions running much upon the firſt and ſecond Commandments, and we having no dual number in *Engliſh*, I thought no body would have cavilled at my uſing the plural.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

What is Idolatry *according to the Determination of clear and free Reaſon.*

1. WE will now try how obnoxious the *Romaniſts* are out of the plain Definitions and Determinations of free and clear Reaſon. In which Method let us ſet down for

The firſt Concluſion, That Idolatry is a kind of Injuſtice againſt God. That this is true, may appear from that Definition of Religion in *Tully*, who defines it *Juſtitiam adverſus Deum.* Which is not the ſenſe of *Tully* onely, but the very voice of Reaſon and Nature. And therefore Idolatry being one kind of Irreligion or Impiety, it muſt needs include in it a kind of Injuſtice againſt God.

2. The ſecond Concluſion; That Idolatry is a very ſore and grievous Diſeaſe of the Soul, vilely debaſing her and ſinking her into *Senſuality* and *Materiality*, keeping her at a diſtance from the true ſenſe and right knowledge of God, and leaving her more liable to bodily Luſts: That the natural tendency of Idolatry is this, and yet the Souls of men, in this Lapſed ſtate, are naturally prone to ſo miſchievous a Diſeaſe, as both Hiſtory and daily Experience do abundantly witneſs. See the Miſchiefs of Idolatry in my *Myſtery of Iniquity*, Part 1. Lib. 1. Ch. 16.

Nor can it infringe the truth of this Concluſion, that a man, retaining ſtill the true Notion of God according to his Divine Attributes, may, according to a ſenſe of his own, bow down toward a corporeal Object of worſhip. For he muſt retain it by force againſt ſuch a Practice, as would and does naturally debauch the uſers of

of it. And beſides, if he had really the Life of God in him as well as the Notion of him, he would feel ſuch Actions grate againſt his heart, and perceive how they would invade and attempt the abating and extinguiſhing the more true and pure ſenſe of God and of his Worſhip, and ſeduce the Soul to external Vanity.

But ſuppoſe a man or two could keep their minds from ſinking down from a right Notion of the Deity; yet they are as guilty of Idolatry, if they give religious Worſhip to corporeal Objects, as he is of Adultery and Fornication that yet uſes them ſo cautiouſly as neither to impair his bodily Health, nor beſott his natural Parts thereby. And therefore, though there may be ſome few ſuch, yet the Laws againſt Fornication and Adultery ought notwithſtanding to be very ſacred to every one, even to thoſe diſcreeter Tranſgreſſours of them, and ever to be obeyed by them, becauſe the Obſervation of them is of ſuch infinite importance to the Publick.

And what we have ſaid of the Worſhip of God is analogically true of honouring of the Saints, who are beſt honoured by the remembrance and imitation of their Vertues, not by ſcraping Legs to or clinging about their Image, which are no more like them than an Apple is to an Oiſter.

3. The third Concluſion; That thoſe high expreſſions of the Jealouſie of God and his ſevere Diſpleaſure againſt Idolatry are very becoming the nature of the thing, and his Paternal care of the Souls of men. This appears from the foregoing Concluſions. For both the Prerogatives and Rights of the Divine Majeſty himſelf are concerned, and alſo the Perfection, Nobilitation and Salvation of the Souls of men. This we diſcover by Reaſon, and our Reaſon is again more ſtrongly ratify'd by Divine Suffrage.

The fourth; That Idolatry, though it be ſo hainous a

Sin, yet where it is committed moſt in good earneſt does neceſſarily involve in it Ignorance or Miſtake, in the Act of Worſhip or in the Object; they either taking the Object to be God when it is not, or to have ſome Attribute of God when it has not, or to enjoy ſome Prerogative of God which yet it does not, or elſe the Worſhip not to be Divine when it is; or, laſtly, they miſtake in the Application of the Worſhip, thinking they do not apply Divine Worſhip to an Object when they do.

The fifth; That to be miſtaken in the Object of Worſhip, or in the Kind of Worſhip, or in the Application, cannot excuſe any-thing from being downright Idolatry; foraſmuch as none are in good earneſt Idolaters without ſome of theſe Miſtakes.

The ſixth; That the peculiar Honour or Worſhip which is given to God is given to him not ſo much as his Honour and Worſhip, as his Due and Right: inſomuch that he that does not give it to God, or communicates it to another, does an injury to the Divine Majeſty. This is plain, and conſonant to what was ſaid on the firſt Concluſion, That Religion is a kind of Juſtice towards God. And indeed if Divine Honour was not given to God as his Due and Right, it were no Honour at all, but rather a Benevolence.

4. The ſeventh; The Right of that peculiar Honour or Worſhip we do to God is grounded either in the nature of his incommunicable Excellencies, or in his Excellencies ſo far as we know incommunicated to any Creature, or, laſtly, in Divine Declaration or Preſcription of the ways or Modes of thus or thus worſhipping him, which himſelf has ſome-time ſet down.

The eighth; That any Actions, Geſtures or Words directed to any Creature as to an Object, which naturally imply or ſignifie either the incommunicable or incommunicated Eminencies of God, is the giving that Worſhip that is the Right and Due of God alone to that Creature,

Creature, and that Injury againſt the Divine Majeſty which is termed Idolatry. The evidence of this Concluſion may appear from hence, becauſe there is no other way of Application of external Worſhip than by directing ſuch ſignificant Actions, Geſtures, or Words, toward ſuch a Being as to an Object.

The ninth; That the uſing any of thoſe Actions or Geſtures, or doing any of thoſe things that the true and ſupreme God did chuſe and challenge in the ſetting out the Mode of his own Worſhip, towards or in reference to any Creature as to an Object, this alſo is that Injury againſt God which we term Idolatry.

The Reaſon is this, Becauſe ſuch a mode of Worſhip does thus manifeſtly appear to be the peculiar Right of God, which none can transfer to another but God himſelf. Wherefore this Right having not been communicated by him to any other, when-ever ſuch a kind of Worſhip is uſed, it muſt be uſed to him, and to none elſe.

Nor can his dereliction of any ſuch Mode of being worſhipped warrant the uſe of it to any Creature afterwards, becauſe no Creature can be God in thoſe circumſtances as he thought fit to inſtitute ſuch a Worſhip for himſelf in: For no Creature can be God at all, and therefore never capable of any of thoſe Modes of Divine Worſhip which God ever at any time inſtituted for himſelf. Beſides, if this dereliction and diſuſe of any Mode of Worſhip might make it competible to a Creature, then might we ſacrifice Beeves and Sheep (beſides other Services of the Temple) to any Saint or *Dæmon*.

5. The tenth; An omnipercipient Omnipreſence, which does hear and ſee what-ever is ſaid or tranſacted in the World, whether conſidered in the whole, or as diſtributed into *terreſtrial*, *celeſtial*, and *ſupercelęſtial*, not onely all theſe Omnipercipiencies but any one of them is a certain Excellency in God, and, for ought we know, incommunicated to any Creature.

The eleventh; That this Omnipreſence or Omnipercipience *terreſtrial* is one main ground of that Religious Worſhip due to God which we call Invocation. This is plain, that upon this very ground that God hears and ſees (though himſelf be inviſible) what-ever is ſaid or done upon earth, he has the honour of being invoked any-where or every-where, and of having Temples built to him; becauſe he that is Omnipreſent cannot be abſent from his Temple, but is alway there to be invoked.

The twelfth; That if Omnipreſence or Omnipercipience, at leaſt *terreſtrial*, (if not *celeſtial*,) be not communicated to Saints and Angels by God, the Invocation of either is palpable Idolatry. This is manifeſt from the eighth Concluſion. For Invocation implies an incommunicated Excellency in the Saints or Angels, and ſo communicates that Right to them that appertains onely to God, and is that Injury againſt God that is called Idolatry.

So that it is a vain Evaſion that pretends that we honour God the more in making him ſo good to the Saints and Angels, as to beſtow this Excellency on them; whenas yet his Wiſdom has not thought fit ſo to do. For we are ſo far from honouring him hereby, that we injure him in giving his Right to another; and we diſhonour him in preſuming he had done wiſelier or better in doing what he has not done. Whenas indeed, if he were ſo laviſh in imparting his proper Excellencies to Creatures as ſome would make us believe he is, to palliate their own Idolatries, it were the next way to make men forget all Applications to God, and to caſt him out of their memory, and take up with the more particular Patronages of Saints and Angels.

6. The thirteenth; That our thinking ſuch a Saint or Angel can hear us where-ever we invoke him, is no excuſe for our Invocation of him, nor ſaves us from Idolatry,

latry, ſince all Idolatry committed in good earneſt implies ſome Miſtake, as has been noted in the fourth Concluſion.

The fourteenth; That all the Modes or ways of the Communication of this Omnipercipiency to Saints or Angels are either very incredible, if not impoſſible, or extremely ridiculous as to any excuſe for their Invocation. For the uſual Reſidence of Saints and Angels being *in ſede Beatorum*, as the *Roman* Church holds, and that place on the *Cœlum Empyreum* above all the Stars, That the Angels and Saints ſhould upon the account of the Exaltedneſs of their natures ſee and hear from thence, what is done or ſaid from one ſide of the Earth to the other, is extremely incredible, if not impoſſible; yea, ſufficiently incredible, or rather impoſſible, though they had their abode on this ſide of the Moon.

And that they ſhould ſee all things and tranſactions, hear all Prayers and Orations, *in Speculo Divinitatis*, is alike incredible; a thing which the Humanity of *Chriſt* himſelf, though hypoſtatically united to the Divinity, did not pretend to. But that God ſhould either in this *Speculum* or any otherwiſe advertiſe them that ſuch a one prays to them that they would pray to him for that party, is it not at firſt ſight above all meaſure ridiculous?

And alike ridiculous it is to pray to Saint or Angel, as if they were preſent and heard our Prayers, when indeed they are abſent, and cannot tell that we did pray, unleſs by ſome Intelligencers. This Devotion is an improper and unnatural act, and ſhews that we do that to an inviſible Creature which is onely proper to be done to the inviſible God; and that therefore it is Idolatry, as giving that right of Worſhip to others which is onely congruous to him.

7. The fifteenth; That though there were communicated by God to Saints and Angels at leaſt a *terreſtrial* Omnipercipiency, yet if he have not communicated the

knowledge thereof to us, as moſt certainly he has not, the Invocation of them is notwithſtanding a very preſumptuous invaſion of the indubitable Rights of God, and the intrenching upon his Prerogatives, and therefore as to the internal Act no leſs than the Sin of Idolatry.

The Reaſons of this Concluſion are, Firſt, That God concealing from us the knowledge of the communication of this Excellency, does naturally thereby intimate that he would not have them invoked, but reſerves the Honour of our Invocation of an inviſible Power unto himſelf onely.

Secondly, That whatſoever is not of faith is ſin: and therefore the ground of Invocation of Saints or Angels being at leaſt dubitable, their Invocation is ſin; and it being about the Rights of God in his Worſhip, what can it be better eſteemed than Idolatry?

Thirdly, This Principle of feigning or groundleſly conceiting, without any Revelation from God, that any Creatures are capable of ſuch Honours as are God's indubitable Right and Prerogative, is the Forge and Shop, the Palliation and Pretenſe, for infinite ſorts and odly-excogitated varieties of Idolatrous Objects: and therefore ſo preſumptuous and ſo abominable a Principle, which is the Mother and Nurſe of ſuch infinite ways of Idolatry and Injuſtice againſt God, even according to humane Reaſon ought to be declared againſt as Idolattous; and conſequently, all the practices thereupon are alſo to be declared Idolatry, becauſe they ſpring from a Principle taken up which is ſuch a fundamental piece of Idolatry and Injuſtice againſt God, and expoſes him to all manner of Idolatrous Injuries.

Fourthly, To dare to do an act we know not whether it may be Idolatry or no, and this needleſly, our Conſcience not all compelling us thereto, this is to dare to commit Idolatry; and the daring to commit Idolatry, and ſo to do defiance to the Majeſty of God, what is it leſs

leſs than to be an Idolater? For according to his inward man and the main Morality of the action he is ſo: As he is morally a Murtherer that, doubting or not knowing but that it is his own Friend, by luck killed his intended Enemy: For the ſenſe is, that rather than not be revenged of his Enemy, he will not ſtick to kill his dearest Friend.

And finally, This Idolatry is the more diſcernable and aggravable in the Invocation of Saints or Angels, their Omnipercipiency being ſo extremely incredible, if not impoſſible or ridiculous, upon any ground, as appears by the foregoing Concluſion.

8. The ſixteenth; That the erecting of ſymbolical Preſence with Incurvations thitherward, the conſecrating of Temples and Altars, the making of Oblations, the burning of Incenſe, and the like, were declared by the ſupreme God, the God of *Iſrael*, the manner of Worſhip due to him, and therefore, without his Conceſſion, this Mode of Worſhip is not to be given to any elſe; as appears by Concluſion the ninth.

The ſeventeenth; That the Pagans worſhipping their *Dæmons*, though not as the ſupreme God, by ſymbolical Preſences, Temples, Altars, Sacrifices, and the like, become *ipſo facto* Idolaters. This is manifeſt from the ninth, the fifteenth, and the foregoing Concluſion.

The eighteenth; Though it were admitted that there is communicated to Saints and Angels at leaſt a *terreſtrial* Omnipercipiency, and that we had the knowledge of this Communication, and ſo might ſpeak to them in a civil way, though unſeen; yet to invoke them in ſuch Circumſtances as at an Altar, and in a Temple dedicated to them, or at their ſymbolical preſence, this were palpable Idolatry. The truth is manifeſt again from the ninth and ſixteenth Concluſions.

9. The nineteenth; Incurvation in way of Religion

towards any open or bare ſymbolical Preſence, be it what-ever Figure or Image, as to an Object, is flat Idolatry: in the Worſhip of Saints, Angels and *Demons* double Idolatry; in the Worſhip of the true God, ſingle. The reaſon hereof is reſolved partly into the ninth and ſixteenth Concluſions, and partly into the nature of Application of Worſhip. For external Worſhip is not any otherwiſe to be conceived to be apply'd to a ſymbolical Preſence, but by being directed towards it as towards an Object. Wherefore if Religious Incurvation be directed towards any Figure or Image as to an Object, this Figure or Image neceſſarily Receives this Religious Incurvation, and partakes with God (if the Image be to him,) in it; which is manifeſt Idolatry. For the direction of our Intention here is but a Jeſuitical Juggle. And therefore I will ſet down for Concluſion

The twentieh, That Religious Incurvation toward a bare ſymbolical Preſence, wittingly and conſcienciouſly directed thither, though with a mental reſerve, that they intend to uſe it merely as a Circumſtance of Worſhip, is notwithſtanding real Idolatry.

The Reaſon is, becauſe an external Action toward ſuch a thing as is look'd upon as receptive of ſuch an Action, (and has frequently received it) if it be thus or thus directed, will naturally conciliate the notions or reſpects of Action and Object betwixt theſe two, whether we intend it or no. And it is as ridiculous to pretend that their motions or actions toward or about ſuch a ſymbolical Preſence are not directed to it or converſant about it as an Object, as it were for an Archer to contend that the Butt he ſhoots at is not the Scope or Object, but a Circumſtance, of his Shooting; and he that embraces his Friend, that his Friend is not an Object, but a Circumſtance, of his Embracing. Which are Conceits quite out of the rode of all Logick. See the laſt Concluſion of the foregoing Chapter.

10. The

10. The twenty-firſt; That the Adoration of any Object which we, out of miſtake, conceive to be the true God made viſible by Hypoſtatical union therewith, is manifeſt Idolatry. The Reaſon is, becauſe Miſtake does not excuſe from Idolatry, by Concluſion the fourth and the fifth. And in this Suppoſition we miſs of one part of the Object, and the onely part that ſingle is capable of Divine Honour. For God to be diſunited from this adored Object is in this caſe all one as to be abſent: For God is not conſidered nor intended in this act of Adoration but as united with this viſible Object. Which reſpect of Union if it fail, that conſideration or Intention alſo fails, and the Worſhip falls upon a mere Creature.

In brief, If out of miſtake I ſalute ſome lively Statue or dead body for ſuch or ſuch a living man, though this Man or his Soul were preſent, and ſaw and heard the Salutation, yet I play the fool, and make my ſelf ridiculous, and am conceived not to have ſaluted him I would: So if I do Adoration to any Object, ſuppoſe the Sun or ſome Magical Statue, for the true Deity viſible, when as neither of them are ſo, I play the Idolater, and make my ſelf impious, and have miſſed of the due Object of my Adoration.

11. The twenty ſecond; That the Adoration of the Hoſt upon the preſumption that it is Tranſubſtantiated into the living Body of *Chriſt* is rank Idolatry. This appears from the precedent Concluſion. To which you may add, that the *Romaniſts*, making Tranſubſtantiation the true ground of their Adoration of the Hoſt, do themſelves imply, that without it were ſo their Adoration thereof would be Idolatry. But that it is not ſo, and that their Ground is falſe, any body may be as well aſſured of as he can of any thing in the world: and no leſs aſſured that they are Idolaters according to their own Suppoſition and Implication, as *Coſterus* indeed does moſt

moſt emphatically and expreſly acknowledge it, if they be miſtaken in their Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; as we ſhall hear anon.

The twenty-third Concluſion; That Adoration given to the Hoſt by Proteſtants or any elſe that hold not Tranſubſtantiation is manifeſt Idolatry. The Reaſon is to be fetch'd from the nineteenth and twentieth Concluſions. For it is Religious Veneration towards a bare corporeal Symbol of the Divine Preſence, and, to make the Action more aggravable, towards a Symbol that has Imagery upon it, and that of the perſon that is pretended to be worſhipped thereby. What can be Idolatry if this be not?

The twenty-fourth; That the Invocation of Saints and Angels, though attended with theſe conſiderations, that both that Excellency we ſuppoſe in them, and which makes them capable of that Honour, is deemed finite, and alſo (be it as great as it will) wholly derived to them from God, yet it cannot for all this be excuſed from groſs Idolatry. This is clear from the ſeventh, eighth, tenth, and ſo on till the ſixteenth Concluſion. For though this Excellency be ſuppoſed finite, yet if it be ſo great as that it is no-where to be found but in God, it is his Right onely to have ſuch Honours as ſuppoſe it. And though it be deemed or conceived to be derived from God, yet if it be not, we give an uncommunicate Excellency to the Creature, and rob God of his Right and Honour. And, laſtly, though this Excellency were communicated, but yet the Communication of it unreveal'd to us, it were a treaſonable Preſumption againſt the Majeſty of God, thus of our own head to divulge ſuch things as may violate the peculiar Rights of his Godhead, and (for ought we know) fill the world with infinite bold examples of the groſſeſt Idolatry: and therefore all our practices upon this Principle muſt be Idolatrous, and Treaſonable againſt the Divine Majeſty. Conſider well the fifteenth Concluſion.

12. The

12. The laſt Concluſion; That this pretended Conſideration, that where *Chriſt* is corporeally preſent, Divine Worſhip is not done to his Humanity, but to his Divinity, and that therefore, though the Bread ſhould not prove tranſubſtantiated, the Divine Worſhip will ſtill be done to the ſame Object as before, *viz.* to the Divinity, which is every-where, and therefore in the Bread; this will not excuſe the Adoration of the Hoſt from palpable Idolatry.

For firſt, That part of the Pretenſe that ſuppoſes Divine Worſhip in no ſenſe due or to be done to *Chriſt*'s Humanity is falſe. For it is no greater preſumption to ſay, that in ſome ſenſe Divine Worſhip is communicable to the Humanity of *Chriſt*, then, that the Divinity is communicated thereto. In ſuch ſenſe then as the Divinity is communicated to the Humanity, which are one by hypoſtatical Union, may Divine Worſhip alſo be communicated to it; namely, as an acknowledgment that the Divinity with all its adorable Attributes is hypoſtatically, vitally and tranſplendently reſiding in this Humanity of *Chriſt*. Which is a kind of Divine Worſhip of *Chriſt*'s Humanity, and peculiar to him alone, and due to him, I mean, to his Humanity, though it be not God eſſentially, but onely hypoſtatically united with him that is; and does as naturally partake of Religious or Divine Worſhip in our Addreſſes to the Divinity, as the body of an eminently-vertuous, holy and wiſe man does of that great Reverence and civil Honour done to him for thoſe Excellencies that are more immediately lodged in his Soul.

Which Honour indiſtinctly paſſes upon the whole man: And as the very bodily Preſence of this vertuous perſon receives the civil Honour, ſo in an eaſie Analogy doth the Humanity of *Chriſt* receive the Divine; but both as partial Objects of what they do receive, and with ſignification of the ſtate of the whole caſe, *viz.* that they are

united,

united, the one with the Divinity, the other with ſo vertuous a Soul. Hence they both become due Objects of that entire external Worſhip done towards them, to the one civil, to the other Divine.

And therefore, in the ſecond place, it is plain, that there is not one and the ſame due Object capable of Religious Worſhip in either Suppoſition, as well in that which ſuppoſes the Bread tranſubſtantiated, as in that which ſuppoſes it not tranſubſtantiated. For in the former it is the true and living corporeal Preſence of *Chriſt*, whoſe whole *Suppoſitum* is, as has been declared, capable of Divine Honour; but in the latter there is onely, at the moſt, but his ſymbolical Preſence, whoſe Adoration is Idolatry, by the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-firſt Concluſions.

And laſtly, The pretending that though the Bread be not tranſubſtantiated, yet the Divinity of *Chriſt* is there, and ſo we do not miſs of the due Object of our Worſhip; this is ſo laxe an Excuſe, that it will plead for the warrantableneſs of the *Laplanders* worſhipping their Red cloth, or the *Americans* the Devil, let them but pretend they worſhip God in them. For God is alſo in that Red cloth and in the Devil in that Notion that he is ſaid to be every-where. Nay, there is not any Object in which the ancient Pagans were miſtaken, in taking the Divine Attributes to be lodged there, whether Sun, Heaven, or any other Creature, but by this Sophiſtry the worſhipping thereof may be excuſed from Idolatry. For the Divine Attributes, as God himſelf, are every-where.

To direct our Adoration toward a ſupernatural and unimitable Tranſplendency of the Divine Preſence, or to any viſible corporeal nature that is hypoſtatically united with the Divinity, moſt aſſuredly is not that ſunk and ſottiſh, that dull and dotardly ſin of Idolatry. For, as touching this latter, to what-ever the Divinity is hypoſta-

tically

tically united, or (to avoid all cavil about terms) ſo ſpecially and myſteriouſly communicated as it is to *Chriſt*, the Right of Divine Worſhip is proportionably communicated therewith, as I have already intimated. And as for the former, That through which the Divine Tranſplendency appears is no more the Object of our Adoration, than the diaphanous Air is through which the viſible Humanity of *Chriſt* appears when he is worſhipped.

But the Euchariſtick Bread being neither hypoſtatically united with the Divinity, nor being the *Medium* through which any ſuch ſupernatural Tranſplendency of the Divine Preſence appears to us, Adoration directed toward it cannot fail of being palpable Idolatry. For the Euchariſtick Bread will receive this Adoration as the Object thereof, by Concluſion the nineteenth and twentieth. But the Adoration or any Divine Worſhip of an Object in which the Divine Attributes do not perſonally reſide, (in ſuch a ſenſe as is intimated in thoſe words of St. *John*, (*Joh.* 1.14.) *And the word was made fleſh*,) but onely locally, as I may ſo ſpeak, this, according to ſound Reaſon and the ſenſe of the Chriſtian Church, muſt be downright Idolatry.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

His Answer to the first, second, and third Conclusions.

His first, second and third Conclusions, saith he, quite digress from the charge in hand, shewing what a grievous sin Idolatry is; which is much more largely and Learnedly declared by our own Authors, and readily granted by them, with this further allowance; that if he can fix the crime upon us with any shew of reason, we shall acknowledge our guilt to be of a double dye.

The Reply.

THese three first Conclusions do not digress from the charge in hand; For as much as they tend to the better understanding of the nature of the charge: As for the first, it is plainly referred to in the sixth Conclusion: And the second and third yield their due Illustration to the fourth, which is framed by way of an *Axioma discretum*; That though Idolatry be a sin of that hainousness, and provoke Gods wrath and Jealousie so, yet it does necessarily involve in it ignorance or mistake, &c. Which does seasonably prevent all vain excuses and subterfuges, all unskilfull extenuations of so deadly a crime; Which I wish I could free the Church of *Rome* from. When as of the contrary:

contrary, out of my love to the Truth and the Church of Christ, I am necessitated to prove her guilty thereof, not by shews of Reason, but by solid and irrefragable Demonstration. Which I pray God open their Eyes to see, that they may wash away their guilt of a double dye, by the tears of a timely Repentance.

Answer to the fourth and fifth Conclusion.

The fourth and fifth, saith he, tell us that Idolatry necessarily involves in it ignorance or mistake in the act of Worship. The fifth advanceth a step higher, and concludes very abruptly; that because all Idolatry involves in it some ignorance or mistake, therefore no Ignorance can excuse from Idolatry: very learnedly!

The Reply.

Not so learnedly neither, or rather not altogether so solidly, as you have set down my Inference in the fifth Conclusion from what preceeded in the fourth. For my own words are these in my fifth Conclusion; *That to be mistaken in the Object of Worship, or in the kind of Worship, or in the Application, cannot excuse any thing from being down right Idolatry; for as much as none are in good earnest Idolaters without some of these mistakes.* How very Learned this is, is another matter, but how firm and solid an Inference it is, I leave any one to Judge.

Answer

Answer to the one and twentieth, and two and twentieth Conclusion.

From the fourth and fifth, the Doctor, saith he, makes a long stride to his one and twentieth Conclusion; where he peremptorily concludes, that because mistake does not excuse one from Idolatry, by Conclusion the fourth and fifth: Therefore the Adoration of any Object, which we out of mistake conceive to be the true God made visible by Hypostatical union therewith is manifest Idolatry. But let us put the case, saith he, that some Christian contemporary to Christ our Lord, whilest he sojourned upon Earth, had through mere mistake adored some other person for Christ. Here the Query arises, whether this mans errour would have pleaded his excuse or no? The reformed Churches of France *in their Apology by* Dally *declare for the affirmative. And if this Errour be not Idolatry, he says, I shall never be able to prove what I aim at in my twenty-second Conclusion, That any Idolatry is committed though it should so fall out, that the Host untransubstantiated were exposed to the veneration of the people. For as no Adoration is here due, so none is intended, but onely to Jesus Christ adorable where ever he is. This is the main strength of his Answer to my twenty first and twenty second Conclusions.*

The

The Reply.

The long ſtride that is made, is made by this Doctor of the Church of *Rome*, not by my ſelf. I had rather he would have taken my Concluſions as they lye in order, which he does hugely neglect to do in this Chapter: But however I am his ſervant to attend his motions whither he pleaſes within the compaſs of this little Treatiſe. And to his Query upon the propounded caſe, I Anſwer, with the reformed Churches of *France*, if they ſpeak no further then to the caſe of this man, (for I never ſaw that Apology by *Daille*) that this mans Errour would have pleaded his excuſe: But not ſo as to argue him guiltleſs of Idolatry, but that his ſin of Idolatry is more pardonable in theſe Circumſtances; pardonable I ſay, which implies a fault or ſin. And ſo my fifth Concluſion holds good; That to be miſtaken in the Object of Worſhip, or in the kind of Worſhip, or in the Application cannot excuſe any thing from being down right Idolatry, becauſe miſtake is neceſſarily ſuppoſed in any Idolatry that is committed in good earneſt. But the invincibleneſs of the miſtake, the ſudden ſurpriſedneſs, or inevitable changeableneſs of the miſtake may be a ground, though not of making that to be no Idolatry which is, yet of excuſing the perſon as to the ſeverity of puniſhment. Whence you may ſee, that it was not for nothing that my Adverſary moulded my fifth Concluſion into words of his own, that he might the eaſilyer have ſomething to Cavil at.

But to let this paſs, I ſay, the Miſtake does not excuſe, but the invincibleneſs, or inevitableneſs of the miſtake, which it does in all other ſins whatſoever. And in all Idolatries whatſoever, beſides theſe committed in the Chriſtian world, where ever they are committed upon invincible miſtake. But as amongſt the Heathen, thoſe that worſhipped the Sun ſuppoſe, taking it to be the ſupreme God, endued with underſtanding and Power, of making and Governing the Univerſe (and Millions worſhipped him under the Notion, and as it ſeems to me were in a manner inevitably, by reaſon of their education and want of opportunity of knowing better, detained in this Errour) as theſe by all men are rightly judged to have been Idolaters, though more excuſable then they that have opportunity of knowing better, ſo it is in the caſe of this man my Adverſary inſtances in, who ſurpriſed by an inevitable errour has his excuſe to crave pardon; but it is manifeſt that he has committed the fault or rather crime of Idolatry, in giving Divine Adoration to him that is not God. And if this were a repeated and habituated act in him, he were as errand an Idolater as the *Perſians* and other Nations that worſhipped the Sun.

For miſtake even where it is not eſſential to a fault, does not deſtroy the nature of the fault: as ſuppoſe one having his hat flung off his head to day by ſome body he meet with in the ſtreets, and next day meeting one like the party that did him the injury, ſhould preſently fling his hat off, the miſtake does

does not take away the nature of this fault ſo as to make it no injury to this Party, but onely makes it more pardonable, it being not intended to an innocent perſon: How then can miſtake even in faults to which miſtake is eſſential change their nature from being what they are? So that though the Idolaters of the Church of *Rome* were under invincible Ignorance, they would not for all that ceaſe to be Idolaters, or though they were made ſuch onely by ſudden and inevitable ſurpriſe.

But this is not their Caſe, and therefore with the good leave of my Adverſary, I muſt tell him, the Caſe he has put is not at all to the preſent purpoſe; nor that of a Loyal Subject taking *Hepheſtion* for *Alexander*: All theſe Learned fetches will not ſerve his turn. The worſhipping of the conſecrated Hoſt with them is neither upon inevitable ſurpriſe, nor invincible Ignorance, nor want of opportunity of knowing better: For that which is accuſtomary, and continual, is not ſurpriſe, nor is that Invincible Ignorance, which common ſenſe, Scripture and Reaſon will ſo eaſily diſſipate in a very ordinary Capacity. For who, unleſs he were under the Power of Diabolical deluſion, but can eaſily undeceive himſelf by common ſenſe, Reaſon and Scripture, that a Wafer which Mice and Rats will eat, cannot be that adorable θεάνθρωπος, God-man, the Creator and Redeemer of us all. And then for opportunities of knowing better from others, what irrefragable evidences have the reformed Churches offered to the contrary, and how many Thouſands have ſealed their Teſtimony

with their very blood? Which is a ſufficient occaſion, I think, in ſo eaſie a Caſe to undeceive them, that are not given up, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, 2 *Theſ.* 2. to believe a lye, for their want of the love of the Truth. So that the Adoration given to the Hoſt upon the preſumption of its being Tranſubſtantiated, is moſt palpable and unexcuſable Idolatry, according as my twenty ſecond Concluſion infers from my twenty firſt, and that from the fourth and fifth. But to ſay, as no adoration is here due, ſo none is intended, but onely to Jeſus Chriſt, adorable where ever he is; is ſuch a laxe Anſwer and unſound, that it will excuſe the *Perſians* worſhipping the Sun, and indeed all the Idolatries in the world as well as the Romaniſts *Artolatria*, or Bread-worſhip; which is a manifeſt Demonſtration of the falſneſs thereof. For no ſerious Idolaters give nor intend any Worſhip, but ſuch and to ſuch Objects as they think it due to.

Anſwer to the ſixth, ſeventh, eighth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, eighteenth and twenty fourth Concluſions, but more particularly to the eighth, tenth and twelfth, and firſt in a more general way.

Theſe eleven Concluſions, ſays he, *talk big againſt the Invocation of Saints. But the beſt ſpeakers amongſt them are the eighth, tenth and twelfth; He ſhould add the fiteenth alſo, that the foundation may be more ſquare and ſtable: which I deſire my Reader to*

to read over, and then conſider my Antagoniſts Anſwer in general to them. Behold then, ſays he, *the Doctors Argument.* Invocation implies an incommunicated excellency in the Saints, *viz.* an omnipercipient Omnipreſence, at leaſt *Terreſtrial* if none *Ccleſtial*, and ſo communicates that right to them that appertains onely to God. *Ergo, Invocation of Saints is palpable Idolatry. Now if we can but acquit our ſelves handſomely in a fair return to this Argument, all the reſt that is to be found in the above ſaid eleven Concluſions, will amount to no more then meer empty and inſignificant Nothings.*

The Reply.

Here I would underſtand of my Adverſary, what he means by quitting of himſelf handſomely, and making a fair return to this Argument. For I ſuſpect in ſuch fair and ſmooth language, there lyes ſome cunning ſlight, or trick of *Legerdemain* to impoſe upon his Reader, and keep the ſimple ſtill in Ignorance. And therefore it is ſeaſonable here to advertize them, That unleſs he bring evident proof out of the Holy Oracles of God, out of ſome Univerſal Council, that is really Univerſal, and held before the lapſed Ages of the Church, or from clear and convictive Reaſon, that an omnipercipient Omnipreſence, at leaſt *Terreſtrial*, is an excellency communicated to the Saints; that all what he ſays will be nothing to the purpoſe; the ground of my Argument in thoſe Concluſions touching the Invocation of Saints, being laid chief-

by in this, *That there is no convincing proof of any ſuch omnipercipiency in the Saints*, but that men doing no violence to their faculties naturally conclude the Contrary, and condemn the other conceit as a mere extravagancy. And then ſecondly, I advertiſe this, that though we ſhould prove there is this omnipercipiency of the Saints, (which yet he has not proved, and I am well aſſured cannot prove) all the reſt of my Concluſions will not Prove inſignificant Nothings. For the fifteenth and eighteenth will have their uſe ſtill. But I am well aſſured his handſom and fair return is ſo gentle and civil, that it has not ruffled the leaſt hair of any of theſe Concluſions, in that he has done no execution upon the eighth, tenth, twelfth, and fifteenth on which the reſt depend; which we ſhall underſtand after we have ſet down the manner of his particular aſſault on theſe.

His Anſwer more particularly to the eighth, tenth, and twelfth Concluſions.

In order to this he caſts the Centuries of the Church into two ſorts, into thoſe that were more ancient, not yet reſolved whether the Saints entred into Heaven before the Day of Judgement, or were confined to ſome other place of reſt excluded from the beatifick viſion, and thoſe that are more Modern and reſolved of that point. The former was the ſtate of the Church till the Council of Florence, *who cleared the Point, defining that the Souls of the dead, as ſoon as cleanſed from all ſin, are received into Heaven*

ven and see God clearly as he is in himself. Now his Argument proceeds in reference to these elder times thus; As for those elder Centuries, says he, before the Council of Florence, *they held Invocation of Saints for an undoubted truth, though some of them doubted whether they heard our prayers or no; because no Church-definition had as then ascertained them of their full beatitude; let venerable Antiquity speak for it self by the mouth of a Saint* Austin, *who in his book* De Cura pro mortuis, *cap.* 16. *speaks thus. This question exceeds the reach of my judgement, how the Martyrs relieve those who are certainly assisted by them? Whether they are present by themselves at the same time in so many several places where the benefit of their succour is received? Or being retired from the Conversations of Men in some place proportioned to their Merits, and there interceding for the relief of those that call upon them, as we pray for the dead who are not really present with them, and know not how they are or what they do; God Omnipotent and ever present, hearing the prayers of the Martyrs, grants to Men by the Ministry of Angels these helps, where he will, when he will, and how he will. Thus B. S.* Austin, *Here we have it, says he, from an undoubted work of this great Saint and Doctor (owned by himself in his Retractations:)*

First, That Invocation of Saints was the constant avowed practise of those elder and purer days.

Secondly, (Contrary to the Doctors fifteenth Conclusion and all his Pharisaical scruples) here

is a ſure and certain ground of this Invocation, *viz.* Unqueſtionable, ancient, and immemorial poſſeſſion, and the often experienced benefit of it, by thoſe who addreſſing themſelves to the holy Martyrs mediation, were (ſays St. *Auſtin*) certainly aſſiſted by them.

Thirdly, That the Saints preſence at the ſame time in ſo many ſeveral places, (which is equivalent to the Doctors *Terreſtrial omnipercipient Omnipreſence*) does not at all in St. *Auſtins* opinion, either imply an Impoſſibility, or entrench upon any of the Divine excellencies: for then he would certainly have rejected it; which yet he does not.

Fourthly, Waving this *omnipercipient Omnipreſence*, St. *Auſtin* renders it eaſily intelligible, how the Saints might, (even without that, and without the hearing our prayers) relieve thoſe that called upon them, *viz.* God omnipotent and ever preſent hearing the Prayers of the Martyrs, and granting to Men by the Miniſtry of Angels theſe helps when he will, where he will and how he will.

Out of all which I deduce, ſays he, *this Inference which is home to the point, That if St.* Auſtin *be to be credited before Dr.* More, *It is good and profitable to invocate the Saints, though we know not whether they heard us or no. And till the Doctor can prove the contrary, his main Hypotheſis upon which he builds* (viz. *That an omnipercipient Omnipreſence, is the onely ground of the Invocation*

vocation of Saints) is fundamentally subverted, and all his vapouring pretenses of Idolatry end in smoke and phancy.

The Reply.

It would make even a serious man smile to observe what a fair and handsom return he has made to the ground of my Argument, comprised in those four Conclusions. I thought there was some circumvention and winding about to ensnare in such smooth words. And lo! a marvellous fetch of wit, To prove from those Ages (and this he must prove, or else he proves nothing to the purpose, that is, to excuse them from Idolatry) wherein the Church knew not whether the Saints had any knowledge of our affairs or no, (as yet not assured whether they enjoyed the beatifick vision before the day of Judgement) that an omnipercipient Omnipresence was an excellency then communicated to them; which seems to be the prospect of his first way of Arguing in general, or else that we may pray to them though they do not hear us at all: Which yet is as delirant an Action, as if one of us here in *England* should speak to an absent friend in the East Indies. And yet to invoke the Saints, uncapable of hearing us, is not onely equally absurd, but grosly Idolatrous; by Conclusion eighth.

But let us see if he be more succesfull in his particular Applications, which I confess to me are so wondrous subtil, and his Collections from that Quotation

Quotation of St. *Auſtin* ſo marvailous fine, that the dulneſs of my ſight cannot diſcern the coherence. For firſt that he ſhould collect, that the Invocation of Saints was the conſtant and avowed Practiſe of thoſe elder days, from that Paragraph of St. *Auſtin*, is without all ground, and implies that St. *Auſtin* underſtood not his own meaning, and writ things contrary to his own Judgement. For himſelf was an Oppoſer and diſallower of that fond and Idolatrous Superſtition that began to creep up in his time, and a rejecter of it as a practiſe Uncatholick and againſt Scripture. So far was it from being a conſtant and avowed Practiſe in thoſe days. A poſition that is both falſe in it ſelf, nor any way deducible from any thing here in this Paragraph of St. *Auſtin*, as it is in the Latine Text. Which is, *Et tamen generaliter orantibus pro indigentia ſupplicantium*, that is, *Praying in general for the relief or neceſſities of Suppliants*: Which is not Suppliants to them, but to God, though at their Memorials. So that my Adverſary in rendring *ſupplicantium*, *of thoſe that call upon them*, has toiſted in *them*, contrary to the meaning of St. *Auſtin*. For it is onely *ſupplicantium* in him, not *ſupplicantium ipſis*. Nor could St. *Auſtin* diſallowing Invocation of Saints as an Impious Worſhip, conceive God ſo ready to hear their Prayers if they prayed to the Saints. For God heareth not ſinners, nor could be the Author of ſo foul a ſin, by fullfilling ſuch petitions by the Miniſtry of his holy Angels, as is here ſaid. Wheretore thoſe that Invocated God onely and Jeſus Chriſt, at the Monuments of the Martyrs, might

might be helped by the Prayers of the Martyrs, though they themselves were not prayed to. I say, men making their addresses to God through Jesus Christ, that they might be delivered from this or that evil, at the Memorials of the Martyrs might be healed and relieved, and this imputed some way to these Martyrs, their Prayers in general for them, (God having a mind to improve their sufferings for a further propagation of his Church) contributing to the effect. But that Invocation of Saints was no allowed nor avowed practise of the Church in St. *Austins* time is most certain, as any one may see at large in the Bishop of *Armagh* and *Chemnitius* and others, who have bestowed their pains on this point.

And therefore his second Inference is a meer Vaunt, That here is a sure and certain ground of Invocation, to wit, unquestionable, ancient, and immemorial possession, and the often benefit of it by those, who addressing themselves to the holy Martyrs mediation were certainly assisted by them, and that in those times when they knew not whether they heard their Prayers or no, whereby he would subvert the Truth of my fifteenth Conclusion. But it is apparent, if you Read those who are impartial searchers of Antiquity; that this ground my Adversary alledges is a very rotten and Reprobate ground, which as it is not asserted by St. *Austin* here, so is it disapproved by him else where, and condemned as a wicked superstitious Innovation, begun amongst weak and ignorant Souls, against the sense and tenour of Scripture, and practise of the

the Catholick Church. And that therefore those helps that were afforded at the Monuments of the Martyrs, were to them that made their addresses to God through Jesus Christ. But if any happened to any that prayed to the Martyrs, it might well be either an Accident in Nature, or some officious delusion of the Devil, to plunge the Church into further Apostasie. So little force is there in this second Inference from the pretense of either avowed practise or effect, in the Age of St. *Austin* before the beatifick vision of the Saints was ratified, to enervate my fifteenth Conclusion. But on the contrary, if the Church had ratified the Invocation of Saints upon no assurance they had of their hearing our Prayers, they had notoriously lapsed the Christian World into Idolatry. And as many as took up that custom in those days, were assuredly Idolaters, as *Epiphanius* defines of his *Collyridians*. So that the Sallies of my Adversary hitherto are in vain.

And now for the third Inference, Does St. *Austins* doubting of the Martyrs, after what manner they yield their help to those that are helped by them, *Utrum ipsi per se ipsos adsint, uno tempore tam diversis locis & tantâ inter se longinquitate discretis*, confirm the belief that they are at so far distant places at once to help, which my Adversary says is equivalent to the *Terrestrial omnipercipient Omnipresence*, which I deny to be in them? Certainly no, But so venerable a Fathers doubting of it rather, makes the thing doubtfull. Nor do I think he was of so slow a wit, but that if he had thought

thought a little cloſer on the matter, he would have declared it out of all doubt, and concluded it impoſſible, that any finite Being ſhould be in one moment of time at two diſtant places at once, a whole diameter of the Earth removed one from another, and a ſemicircle, or at leaſt a quadrant, diſtant in the ſurface of the Earth, if we reckon more places then two. For the motion muſt be either unconceivably ſwift, or the Saint intirely divided into two whole Saints in two diſtinct places at once. This I believe would have ſeemed little leſs then impoſſible to St. *Auſtin*, and plainly to entrench upon the Omnipreſence of God; ſure I am it ſeemed ſo to *Athanaſius* or whoever was Author of thoſe Queſtions *ad Antiochum*, (*Queſt.* 26.) Μόνε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν δυσὶ τόποις ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἴσῃ εὑρίσκεται. *It is the priviledge of God alone to be found in more places then one at once.* And *Anaſtatius Nicenus*, Οὔτε γὰρ ἄγγελος δύναται ἐν διαφόροις τόποις ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἴσῃ ὀπτάνεσθαι εἰ μὴ μόνος ἀπερίγραπτος Θεός. *For neither can an Angel be ſeen in ſeveral places at once, but God onely can be ſo, who is uncircumſcribable by any place, Queſt.* 89. But if St. *Auſtin* does but onely doubt, it is ſufficient for me. For if we be not certain of the omnipercipient Omnipreſence of the Saints, we have no warrant nor right to invoke them, as doing that honour to them, which is the undoubted Privilege of God, and thereby incurring the crime of Idolatry, by Concluſion fifteenth. For if there be no ſuch omnipercipient Omnipreſence communicated to the Saints; it is plain from Concluſion, 12.

That

That it is Idolatry. But if we know not whether this omnipercipient Omnipreſence be communicated or no to them, then when we adventure to invocate them, we know not whether we commit Idolatry or no, that is, we do a doubtfull or uncertain action, and act not out of faith. But he that acts not out of faith does ſin, and ſins ſpecifically that ſin, which he doubts whether he ſo doing commits or no. As if he doubt whether ſuch a thing be Extortion, and yet do it, he commits the ſin of Extortion. So he that does an act which he knows not whether it is Idolatry or no, he commits the ſin of Idolatry in adventuring to do it, as to the inward man; but the Saints having no ſuch Omnipercipiency, (as any one that is free from Superſtition cannot but be eaſily aſſured of) it is Idolatry both as to the inward and the outward.

And now for his fourth Inference; That waveing this omnipercipient Omnipreſence, St. *Auſtin* renders it eaſily intelligible, how the Saints might relieve them that call upon them, *viz.* God omnipotent and ever preſent hearing the Prayers of the Martyrs, and granting to men by the Miniſtry of Angels thoſe helps, *&c.* I have above plainly ſhown that St. *Auſtin* aſſerts no ſuch thing as the Invocation of Saints in this *Paragraph*, or that the Saints are called upon; But God being called upon at the Memorials of the Saints by ſuppliants, and the Saints praying in general for us, God is pleaſed to ſend relief to his ſuppliants by the Miniſtry of Angels. This is all that is affirmed by St. *Auſtin*; which

which makes nothing to the proving, That according to St. *Auſtin*, though the Saints do not hear our Prayers, yet we may Pray unto them.

And therefore his general Concluſion of all which he ſo exults in, and ſays is ſo home to the Point, (*viz.* That if St. *Auſtin* be to be credited before Dr. *More*; It is good and profitable to invocate the Saints though we know not whether they hear us or no) is a Caſtle in the Air, and ſtands upon no Foundation, ſince all the four Pillars that ſhould ſuſtain it are fallen into duſt. For neither does St. *Auſtin* ſay, That it was the conſtant and avowed practiſe of thoſe elder and purer days to invoke the Saints, nor that any received help from the Martyrs by invoking them, nor does he aſſert, but doubt of the omnipreſence Terreſtrial of the Saints; nor is it credible, but upon better conſideration he as well as *Athanaſius* and *Anaſtatius*, would have concluded it impoſſible; nor laſtly does he affirm, that God by the Miniſtry of Angels did relieve them that prayed to the Saints, but onely ſuch as at the Memorials of the Saints prayed to himſelf.

But I will not content my ſelf with this, but I will further add; That if St. *Auſtin* and Dr. *More* be to be believed before this Doctor of the Church of *Rome*, it is very ill and pernicious to invocate the Saints whether they hear us or no. And concerning my own Judgment, I think this Doctor of *Rome* will confeſs there is no controverſy. Now for the Judgment of St. *Auſtin*, I think he ſufficiently declares himſelf, in his *De Civitate*

Dei

Dei, Book 22. chap. 10. *We build no Temples*, says he, *to our Martyrs as to Gods, but Memorials, as to dead Men, whose Spirits are alive with God; nor do we there erect Altars on which we Sacrifice to the Martyrs, but to that one and Common God of the Martyrs and us. At which Sacrifice the Martyrs as Men of God, who by the Confession of him have overcome the World, are recited in their place and order, but not invoked by the Priest that Sacrificeth.* And in his 42. Epistle, *You see*, saith he, *the most eminent head of the most Renowned Empire, stooping with his Diadem, and Praying at the Sepulchre of* Peter *the Fisherman, namely, to God himself it is that he prayes, though at the Monument of* Peter. And lib. 1. Confes. chap. 42. *Whom may I find that should reconcile me to thee? was I to go to the Angels? with what Supplication? with what Sacraments? many indeavouring to return unto thee? and of themselves being not able, have, as I hear, attempted such things, and have been thought worthy to be ill-used*, &c. And is there not the same Reason of the Mediation and Invocation of Saints. And against *Parmenian.* lib. 2. cap. 8. he says, *That if St.* John *should say, You have me a Mediatour with the Father, I pray for your sins* (*as* Parmenian *would have the Bishop to be a Mediatour betwixt God and the people*) *who would look upon him as an Apostle of Christ, but as Antichrist.* And in the same place, *For if* Paul *were a Mediatour, the rest of the Apostles would be so too; and if there were many Mediatours, how would that of* Paul *agree, who says their is one Mediatour*, &c. And we know that Invocation in the most

most modest sense, is for the Mediation and Intercession of the Saints, that they may intercede for us. In a word if you consult St. *Austin*, he is so far from approving Invocation of Saints, that he is a diligent Opposer of it, as you may see more at large in *Chemnitius*. And still, which will make my Adversaries Argument weaker and weaker, if St. *Austin* had been an approver of it, yet that would not have proved, that it had been a constant and an avowed practise of those purer times, from the Apostles to St. *Austins* Age; there being for 360 Years after Christ no Testimony for any such thing, none of the Fathers appearing for it, but determining point blank against it. But the Apostasie being to come in according to Prediction, about 400 Years after Christ; if any Father, and St. *Austin* amongst the rest, should write any thing in favour of so foul a crime, it would avail nothing with the prudent and unprejudiced. So that here is a ratiocination worse than nothing, and the smoke and phancy appears on my Adversaries side, but on mine the clear and solid Reason. Nor need I use any further Arguments to prove, that it is not good nor profitable to invocate the Saints, than what I have subnected to my fifteenth Conclusion, which sufficiently proves it is a sin: And I think sin will be held by no good Christian either good or profitable.

And thus you see my Antagonist fully routed in his first method of attempting my four chief Conclusions, *viz.* the eighth, tenth, twelfth, and fifteenth, he pretending that Invocation of Saints

may be without Idolatry, though we know not whether they hear us or no; which was a more oblique and incongruous Method, and leſs likely to bring about what he would have.

His more direct Anſwer to the above ſaid four Concluſions.

His ſecond Method is more natural, direct and pertinent, if he can make his attempt good, viz. *That we have a certain or ſufficient knowledge, that the Saints have at leaſt a Terreſtrial Omnipercipiency, and hear all thoſe that pray to them; which they*, ſays he, *moſt certainly do.* 1. *From their bliſsfull Viſion of God: not gainſaid by Proteſtants, and determined by the Council of* Florence. 2ly. *It is to be proved by the appearance of Devils upon the Invocation of Witches and Sorcerers.* 3ly. *From the Æquality of the Saints with the Angels*, Mat. 22. 30. 4ly. *And laſtly, From the weakneſs of the Objections taken from the Incredibility of the Modes of this Omnipercipiency of the Saints. Becauſe*, poteſt conſtare de re quando non conſtat de Modo rei, *which I allow to be a ſound Maxime. This is the ſum of all the force he has to make out a certain or ſufficient aſſurance, that the Saints hear our Prayers: Which by the way is to be underſtood of every particular Saint that is called upon by chance, or elſe its little to the purpoſe. And then again it is worth the noting, That if it were poſſible to bring certain or ſufficient proof, that every particular Saint hears us, it will not follow that a Religious*

ligious Invocation is competible to them, which the Circumstances of the Romish Worship argue to be given to them, but onely a civil calling to, or asking them to do this or that. For no honour but civil is due to them, as St. Austin *himself up and down asserts. And it is further to be noted, that if they do not hear us, the Invocation then is not civil, but non-sensical, and which is worse, Idolatrous, by Conclusion twelfth. And therefore let us examine particularly the Arguments he produces to make good the contrary, namely that they do hear, and we should add, by the intrinsick vertue of that state they are in. But let us see at large how he proves they hear us at all.*

The Reply.

His first Argument is, That they enjoy the beatifick Vision, not gainsaid by Protestants, and determined by the Council of *Florence*. But does some of the Protestants not gainsaying, that they enjoy the beatifick Vision, prove they affirm it? or rather do not they deny it, in denying that the consummation of our Happiness, which is the beatifick Vision, is till the Resurrection, when Christ shall appear, and we then being transformed into his glorious Similitude, shall thereby see him as he is? but till then few or no Protestants surely dream of a beatifick Vision. And if they did, how do we prove but that they are mistaken; especially the Scripture seeming to defer that great and signal Happiness till that day; though they do not deny

them a pleasant rest, and enjoyment of the Divine favour before then?

But the Council of *Florence*, a general or Oecumenical Council, has determined the point, and therefore we may be certain that the Saints do already enjoy the beatifick Vision. The words of the Definitive sentence, as is supposed, of the Council, are, καθαρῶς θεωρεῖν αὐτὸν τὸν ἕνα καὶ τρισυπόστατον θεὸν καθώς ἐστιν. *To see clearly the Triune God himself as he is.* And the *Speculum Trinitatis*, the clear Looking-glass of the Trinity is answerable to this stile of the Council. So that I must confess, if there be sufficient Authority in this Council, my Adversary has so fast hold of me, that I must acknowledge that they have determined, That purified Souls do enjoy the beatifick Vision before the day of Judgment. But there are many things that make me think that this Council has not authority enough to assure any prudent man that this Position is true.

For first it determines also for Transubstantiation and the universal Supremacy of the Pope, declaring him to have the Power and right of ruling and governing the whole Church. The former of which is manifestly impossible, the latter grosly injust against Christ the only universal head of the Church, and against the particular supreme Heads of Christian Nations and Kingdoms, over whom this Synod declares the Pope set over to govern as supreme. Which by how much more it seems to favour the Popes immoderate ambition, by so much it seems more certainly to deviate *de via Spiritus sancti*, and show the Council not to be infallible but rather

rather actually Erroneous. And if they were so in these things that are more obvious and discernible, *viz.* That a wafer or a piece of bread is not Jesus Christ the Son of God, Nor the Pope the universal Soveraign of all Christendom; may not any one justly wonder how they became Infallible in determining what is the state of the Saints in Heaven, themselves having never looked into that Looking-glass of the Trinity, nor experienced what it is to see God as he is. *Mat.* 5. 8. *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* And again, *Psal.* 17. 15. *When I awaken into thy likeness, I shall be satisfied therewith,* viz. with the Eternal Righteousness of God, whereby we become like him, and so see him as he is.

Secondly, If this opinion of the beatifick Vision had been true, and usefull for the excusing of the Church from Idolatry in the Invocation of Saints, as my Adversary seems to insinuate, surely the Holy Ghost would have revealed it more timely. For this Council of *Florence* was not held till about 1440 or 50 years after Christ; wherefore it coming so extreme late, it is a sign, it is onely a device found out by men to stop the mouths of them that object against the Invocation of Saints, from their Incapacity of hearing our Prayers.

Thirdly, Besides these flaws, the certainty and infallibility of this Council is blasted from the clear prediction of the Apostasy of the Church after about 400 or 500 years after Christ. And therefore we Protestants do well to have no great regard to any more then the four first general Councils.

Fourthly and lastly, Though this Council had the face and appearance of a free Oecumenical Council, it was not at all so in reality and Truth. The Greek Bishops and others of that Clergy, being many ways necessitated against their own Judgments and Consciences to subscribe that form, which the Emperour *Johannes Paleologus* and *Joseph* the Patriarch had upon politick Ends, with some few others, contrived. So that *Sylvester Syuropulus* a person of singular integrity and Judgment, and a perpetual witness of the transactions of that Council, as in particular he has noted, how the the Bishop of *Ephesus* was denied his *Florens*, because he was so inflexible to the purposes of the Pope. How the Latines produced a false and adulterate Creed of the seventh general Council, affirming that it was so read μετὰ τῆς προσθήκης with the addittament of *Filioq;* in that Council. How the Emperor observing that his Clergy was for the greatest part of them against the Latine Church in their votes, found a device to deprive all of votes but the Bishops and *Cœnobiarchæ.* How falsely and fraudulently they read the places of the Fathers, mutilating them, and mangling them as they pleased, and was most for their purpose. How that after all this ado, but ten of the Bishops and *Cœnobiarchæ* gave their votes for τὸ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ for the *procession of the Spirit from the Son*, seventeen against it. How hereupon consultation was held again of purging the Council, but that way declined both the Patriarch and the Emperour dealt under hand with the most effectual perswasions of fear

fear and hope that they could. And at last how they brought it to this, that thirteen Bishops gave their votes for τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ὑοῦ, but the *Cœnobiarchæ's* votes were made null by a trick, least they should have turned the scales again. How the Lay Courtiers even to the Physicians and meaner sort of Officers were enabled to vote, when so many of the Reverend Clergy were by devices made vote-less. And lastly, when by these arts they had got a plurality to declare for τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ὑοῦ, and the Emperour made a long speech extolling the present Synod, and delivering his own suffrage to close all: How his Greyhound that constantly followed him to the Council, and lay on a silk cushion wrought with Gold, at the Emperors feet every Session, and in so many Sessions had lain still, both when the Emperour spake, and also others, did now so soon as the Emperour began to speak set up a shril howling note, modulated to the very cadences of the Emperours Oration, nor could they by any sneaping of him, or threatning him, keep him from so doing: Which, *says he*, many look't upon as an inauspicious sign.

This is also observable, How nothing but τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ὑοῦ, was so much as disputed in the Synod: But the Emperour with some few of his own, the Cardinals ever and anon visiting him, and propounding Questions to him, added four more Articles as agreed upon, amongst which, by the by, there is no mention of the bea ifick vision, which I observe others also to omit. And how *Nicenus* made a long and eloquent speech in publick, which

contained things as agreed on by the Greek Church which yet they knew nothing of, Ἦτο δὲ ὅλον πανεργία καὶ συσκοινὴ, *but it was altogether a pack't device:* but that however moſt of the Greek Clergy, what by promiſe, what by threatnings and urging neceſſities, (for the Biſhop of *Nicomedia* poor man was fain by friends to beg a new Cloak of the Pope, that he might not diſgrace the Solemnity by the ſqualour of his old apparel) much againſt their wills were brought off to ſubſcribe the form, and make their appearance at the celebration of the union. I ſay, beſides theſe particulars and many more that this *Sguropulus* ſets down, which plainly ſhows, that this was not a Synod held *per viam Spiritus ſancti*; he in general alſo tells us, That it was indeed an Oecumenical Synod, no man can deny, ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀποφάσιν ἵνα ἡ σύνοδος ἀπεφήνατο ἀδεὶς τῶν ἐκεῖσε παρόντων ἐρεῖ, *But no man that was there will ever affirm that they came to any Synodical ſentence or determination.* For after the publick diſceptations ceaſed, nothing was inacted; ἀλλ' ἰδίως καὶ κρύφα καὶ συνεσκιασμένως πάντα ἐγένοντο, *but all things were tranſacted in hugger-mugger,* by a few Prelates both on the Emperors part and the Popes, the reſt of the Greek or Latine Biſhops knowing nothing: and much more to this purpoſe may you read in this accurate deſcriber of this *Florentine* Council. But it is ſufficiently evident already how little ground there is in this *Florentine* Council, to found any mans belief of any Concluſion they are ſaid to have defined, and to venture on ſo hainous a ſin as Idolatry, as certainly Invocation of Saints is, be it called civil Worſhip

Worſhip or Religious; if they hear us not, when the Authority of this Council is ſo uncertain or rather null, which my Adverſary would make uſe of to prove that they do hear us, becauſe purified Souls injoy the beatifick Viſion before the Day of Judgement according to that Councils determination.

And if my Adverſary would teach his Party here to evade, by ſaying what ever this Council may prove, it is well known that the Council of *Trent* has concluded the ſame opinion; I Anſwer, that the three firſt things alledged againſt the Council of *Florence*, are alſo alledgeable againſt the Council of *Trent*, and beſides they have determined for the Communion in one kind, and for the worſhipping of Images, expreſly againſt the word of God, whereby we cannot but be well aſſured of their Fallibility. Beſides that it is evident that it is neither a free nor general Council, but a company of men contrived together for the Intereſt of the Pope, thirteen new Cardinals, all *Italians*, being made by him at a clap toward the end of the Synod, beſides much garbling of the Council before. And the Holy Ghoſt is alſo ſaid at the time of their ſetting to have Travailed from *Rome* to *Trent* in a Portmanteau, another evidence how much that Synods proceedings were *per viã Spiritus ſancti*. And therefore to adventure to commit ſo hainous a crime as Idolatry, upon ſo weak a pretence as the Authority of ſuch a Council, what can be more horrid?

But admit the Saints do enjoy the beatifick Viſion, how is it proved that the beatifick Viſion is ſuch as implies the ſight and hearing of all viſible and

and audible Objects here on Earth, or that to a meer Creature it would be any happiness at all, but rather an unhappiness and a burdensom and unseasonable distraction.

Diu quis vivendo multa quæ non volt videt.

Wherefore it is most reasonable to conceive, that onely such things are exhibited to them by God, as they are particularly concerned in. And that all things and Persons of this caliginous Globe, are not obtruded on them in the beatifick Vision, where there is infinitely more then will fill them of better Objects. And therefore the beatifick Vision as to this Point, will amount to no more then to one of those Modes of the Saints knowing when we pray unto them; which I think I have not without cause declared to be absonous and absurd as to the solving of this difficulty, in my fourteenth Conclusion. And we may further here take notice, that they make God an abettour of a very incongruous Act, the putting up Prayers to a finite invisible Power, which of himself knows not whether he be prayed to or no, unless God be so officious as to give him notice of it. The thing therefore is so incredible in it self, and supported by so weak Authority of the *Florentine* and *Tridentine* Councils, that no certain or sufficient assurance can from hence be had thereof.

Now for the next Argument, fetch'd from the Devils appearing upon the Invocation of Witches or Sorcerers; I conceive it has little force to prove

prove that any particular Saint invocated by name, does preſently of himſelf hear the Invocations of his Clients, though ſome be in *America*, others in the *Eaſt-Indies*, others in *Italy* at the ſame time. Which I deny that any particular Devil can do: And therefore the Inference will be infirm, to conclude that Saints hear the Prayers of their Suppliants, when they are particularly called upon, and at whatſoever diſtant parts of the Earth at the ſame time; becauſe ſome particular Devils hear Sorcerers ſo, when there is no proof they do. Any particular Devil may ſtep in if Magically invoked, to delude a ſinner, and when Covenant is once made, that very Familiar by name may be ready to aſſiſt being invoked; but this falls very ſhort of proving, that a Devil let him be at what diſtance he will from a Suppliant, that he hears, or that he can hear and aſſiſt many Thouſands of Suppliants in many Thouſand far diſtanced places at once. Which Incapacity not onely of a Devil but a Saint makes their Invocation Idolatry by Concluſion twelfth.

But at laſt my Adverſary knocks at the door of the moſt important Topick of all, for the proof of the Saints knowing the Prayers of their Suppliants; I mean the holy Scripture, and if he produces any place there to prove they hear when we ſpeak to them: I will ſo far forth yield up the cudgels to him, as to acknowledge a civil calling to them, or deſiring them to do this or that for us, that is really in their power to effect, may not be abſurd. The place he cites is *Matth.* 22.30. The Saints are

as

as the Angels of God in Heaven, ſays he, and of the Angels it is written, *See ye deſpiſe not one of theſe little ones, for I ſay unto you, their Angels in Heaven always ſee the face of my Father which is in Heaven*, Matth. 18. 10. And again, *There ſhall be joy in Heaven upon one ſinner that repenteth*, Luke 15. 7.

To the latter I Anſwer firſt, if it were the priviledge of Angels, through the excellency of their own nature, to know at what diſtances ſoever they are at when men prayed to them, why was the Invocation of Angels laid aſleep all the time of the Moſaical Law? and why ſpoken againſt by the very Goſpel? or what warrant has the Church of *Rome* to invoke Saints, more then the *Jews* to invoke Angels? But moreover I Anſwer to that of *Matth.* 18. 10. The ſenſe, of *the Angels in Heaven always ſeeing the face of Chriſts Father which is in Heaven*, is not, that by enjoying the ſight of God they obtain thereby a terreſtrial Omnipercipiency, and ſee and hear all things tranſacted here on Earth; but the phraſe of ſeeing the face of Chriſts Father in Heaven, ſignifies, that they are thoſe Angels that alſo Miniſter and wait before God and are Aſſiſtents at the Divine *Schechina* or that inimitable glory whereby God reveals himſelf to the Angels and bleſſed Spirits, and gives Oracles for the miniſtration of his Kingdom. The Angels I ſay, that aſſiſt holy men on Earth, are of ſo great excellency, that they are in Heaven part of the *Satellitium* that always wait on God who is in Heaven; which alſo implies that they

are

are one while on Earth, another while in Heaven, aſcending and deſcending to negotiate the affairs of the Church, receiving Oracles and commands from the Divine *Schechina.* But inſtead of theſe Oracles of importance, if the Divine *Schechina* ſhould tell St. *Peter*, or St. *Paul*, or St. *Apollonia*, and the reſt of the Saints ever when any pray to them in ſuch infinite diſtinct places, and ſome great numbers put together, praying to ſome or other of the Saints, let any indifferent man judge how incongruous it is. It is ſufficient in the mean time, that no ſuch terreſtrial Omnipercipiency is to be proved in the Angels from this Text. Nor do's *Luk.* 15.7. imply any ſuch thing. For the Angels aſcending and deſcending as *Jacob* ſaw them in his Divine Viſion, on the ladder that reached from Earth to Heaven, thoſe that aſcend from Earth tell them in Heaven of the good news of converted ſinners, and ſo this Text implies no ſuch terreſtrial Omnipercipiency as my Adverſary would inſinuate. But then in the laſt place, ſuppoſe this terreſtrial Omnipercipiency were competible to the Angels, it does not follow from *Mat.* 22. 30. that the Saints already enjoy it. For the entire Text runs thus, *For in the Reſurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in Heaven.* But I hope my Adverſary will not, with *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, affirm the Reſurrection is paſt; and if not ſo, he muſt acknowledge even from this Text himſelf produces, that this Angelical priviledge of the Saints, in ſeeing all things in the face of God, is yet to come, if there were at all any ſuch Angelical priviledge.

The

The last thing he alledges for this Point, is the weakness of our Objections from the Modes of this Omnipercipiency of the Saints; because, *Potest constare de re quando non constat de modo rei.* But I answer, *à posse ad esse non valet consequentia.* If we had indeed the like assurance of the thing it self, That one particular Saint invocated by never so many, and at never so far distant places at once, did hear the Prayers of all those Suppliants, as we have of the Divinity of Christ and the Triunity of the God-head, then though I could not reach the particular Mode how it was, yet I would believe it. But when all manner of Modes producible of a thing seem absurd and incredible, and in the mean time there is no assurance of the Reality of the thing it self, it argues great levity of mind to give belief to such a thing that it at all is. And it is not meer levity in things of such great Importance, as the Rights of God, and the danger of Idolatry, but an irreligious and giddy Temerity; Which I pray God keep all men from.

In the mean time it is very apparent, that his attempts against my eighth, tenth, twelfth, and fifteenth Conclusions are frustraneous, and that they stand as firm as ever, he having neither proved that we may invocate the Saints, we being uncertain whether they hear us or no, nor yet proved it certain that they do hear us; which were the two Methods whereby he could have undermined these four Conclusions. And therefore they standing firm, still it is manifest from his own

own ſuppoſal, that the other ſeven, *viz.* the ſixth, ſeventh, eleventh, thirteenth, fourteenth, eighteenth, and twenty fourth, ſtand firm and unſhaken alſo. We proceed now to his Anſwers to the remaining Concluſions in the order I find them.

His Anſwer to the ninth Concluſion.

Againſt this Concluſion he argues thus; Incurvation of the body, according to my ſixteenth Concluſion, is one of the Actions or Geſtures which God did chuſe in the ſetting out the Mode of his own Worſhip. Ergo, *Incurvation towards or in reference to any Creature is Idolatry. But now,* ſays he, *if this be true,* Abraham *who uſed this Incurvation to Men and Angels,* Gen. 18. *and* 23. *and the beloved Diſciple of Jeſus, who reiterated the like Incurvation towards the Angel,* Apoc. 22. 8. *were Idolaters. And therefore my Concluſion cannot be true, that is laden with ſo great an abſurdity. This is the main of his Argument.*

The Reply.

In Anſwer to which I deſire the Reader to peruſe my ſixteenth Concluſion. My words are theſe, *That the erecting of a Symbolical preſence, with Incurvations thitherward,* &c. I do not ſay that ſimple Incurvation is one of the Actions or Geſtures, which God did chuſe to ſet out the Mode of his own Worſhip by, (for Incurvation of the body in general is neither Religious nor Civil, but may

may be either, as all men know) but that it is *Incurvation toward a ſymbolical Preſence*, which God appropriated to himſelf, as a Religious Mode of Worſhip due to himſelf onely. Simple Incurvation is permitted, and has been uſed, without any ſcandal to God or Man, both unto Men and Angels. Now neither *Abrahams*, nor St. *Johns* Incurvations being to the ſymbolical Preſences of the Angels they bowed to, my ſixteenth Concluſion is unconcerned in it, nor does it therefore at all enervate my ninth, as is plain at firſt ſight. For it does not at all imply that either *Abraham*, or St. *John* were Idolaters in their bowing to Angels or Men.

His Anſwer to the ſixteenth Concluſion.

The ſixteenth, ſeventeenth, nineteenth and twentieth talk much, ſays he, of a ſymbolical Preſence, and Incurvation towards it; whereof the ſixteenth refers to the ninth and hath its Anſwer there.

The Reply.

How infirm my Adverſaries Anſwer is to the ninth and unſatisfactory you have already ſeen, and therefore, I having already replied to it, it is evident that his Anſwer to this ſixteenth wants no further Reply.

His

His Anſwer to the ſeventeenth Concluſion.

To this, ſaith he, *I have already anſwered, ſhewing that the* Pagans *gave the Worſhip and Title of Deities to their* Dæmons, *and therefore became* ipſo facto *Idolaters.*

The Reply.

To that pretended Anſwer, I have made a full and perſpicuous Reply above, which if the Reader be pleaſed to turn back and peruſe, the more he looks on it, I do not queſtion but the more he will be ſatisfied with it.

His Anſwer to the nineteenth Concluſion.

Here, ſaith he, *I would know of the Doctor, whether the Name of a perſon be not a ſymbolical Preſence in its kind as well as an Image. For as much as both of them are ſigns or tokens repreſenting the ſame thing, with this onely difference that the Image repreſents it to the eye, the Name to the ear. And why then may we not bow to the Image of Jeſus as well as to the name of Jeſus, or how can the one be condemned of Idolatry, but the other muſt incur the like brand.*

The Reply.

The Doctor Answers, that the Name may be a symbol, as *Aristotle* has defined. Ἔτι μὲν οὖν τὰ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῶν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ παθημάτων σύμβολα. *A word or Name may be a symbol of that conception I have in my mind*, says *Aristotle*, but he says nothing of its being a symbol of the external Object. But let that go; Though it be a symbol, yet it is very unnatural to conceive it a symbolical Presence, nor is any where called so, nor accounted so by any one. Besides, a symbolical Presence must be a standing permanent representation of that which it is the symbolical Presence of, consecrated and intended for that purpose. How unnatural therefore is it to conceit a name, that is no sooner sounded but vanishes from the senses, to be a symbolical Presence, but onely a meer note or symbol to help our memories, and to be part of speech and discourse: So plain is it, there is not the same reason of the Image of Jesus, and the Name of Jesus. Nor is the second Commandment against bowing to sounds but Images: Nor do we, which is best of all, bow *to* the Name of Jesus, but *at* the Name of Jesus, as I answered above. And if it could be proved that the Name of Jesus were a symbolical Presence of one kind, as my Adversary phrases it; so long as it is not of that kind my nineteenth Conclusion speaks of, and founded on the second Commandment, what is it to the purpose? Or if it were included, unless that of the second to the *Philippians* commanded to bow

to

to it in ſuch a ſenſe, which my Adverſary will be never able to prove, what will it avail? But I have even over-anſwered this Objection. And it is already too too manifeſt, that though bowing at the Name of Jeſus be no Idolatry, bowing to the Image of Jeſus may be palpable Idolatry.

His Anſwer to the twentieth Concluſion.

To me, this Concluſion, ſaith he, ſeems big with a ſpirit of contradiction, as being manifeſtly againſt Scripture, againſt the practiſe of the Church of England, *and laſtly againſt Dr.* More *himſelf. Firſt, Againſt Scripture, As is manifeſt, (beſides what we have ſaid, ſays he, in Anſwer to the laſt Concluſion of the firſt Chapter) from the Incurvation the Scripture commands to the Name of Jeſus, which is as much a Religious Incurvation as any we give to t'oſe ſymbolical Preſences called Images.*

Secondly, Againſt the Church of England, *who bow the knee at the Euchariſt to the bare Figurative or ſymbolical Preſence of Chriſts natural fleſh and blood; and therefore they uſeing this Religious Incurvation towards a ſymbolical Preſence, are Idolaters; Nor can excuſe themſelves by a mental reſerve, they intending it onely as a circumſtance of their Worſhip, becauſe that is declared Equivocation, in this very Concluſion and the foregoing one.*

Thirdly and laſtly, This Concluſion is againſt my ſelf, Becauſe my ſixteenth Concluſion openly avoucheth, That the erecting of a ſymbolical Preſence with Incurvation thitherward, was declared by the ſu-

preme God the God of Israel *one of the manners of Worship due to him; but my twentieth runs counter and stifly presseth, That Religious Incurvation towards a Symbolical Presence (without exception of any) wittingly and conscientiously directed thither, is real Idolatry. These two Conclusions, saith he, are as perfect a contradiction, as to say, All Religious Incurvation toward a symbolical Presence is Idolatry, Not all Religious Incurvation toward a Symbolical Presence is Idolatry.*

The Reply.

To all which three I Reply, and First to the first, That what he has said in Answer to the last Conclusion of my first Chapter, I have replied to already and plainly proved there is nothing therein that clashes with the Scripture. And as I said before, so I again repeat, that we are not commanded to bow to the name of Jesus, but, if it be understood of any external Ceremony, onely at the name of Jesus; and with all, though the Incurvation be Religious, that his name is no symbolical Presence, as I declared before. Never any one phancied a name any such thing, so that it is a meer shift to amuze the ignorant.

To the Second, That the Bread and Wine are no symbolical Presence or Figure of the very Person of Christ, nor do I know that any Protestants hold that any Blood or Flesh of Christ not actuated by his humane Spirit, nor joyned with the Divinity is capable of Divine or Religious Worship, sith nothing is capable thereof but God. But a symbolical

ſymbolical Preſence is the repreſentation of ſome Perſon or thing, erected to repreſent the thing or Perſon conceived by them that erect it, adorable? But we do not conceive the Body of Chriſt killed and Sacrificed, and his Blood ſhed out of his Body adorable; unleſs it could be proved, what yet is impoſſible, that it was even then Hypoſtatically united with God, when it was diſunited from the Soul. So that the broken Bread and the Wine are but commemoration tokens of the Body of Chriſt killed and Crucified, and his Blood ſhed for us, this commemoration being as it were a feaſt upon a Sacrifice, as the Apoſtle intimates, (1 *Cor.* 5. 7.) after the Lamb is perfectly ſlain. Nor is any man on his knees at the Communion in order to direct their kneeling to the Bread or Wine in any ſenſe, but they are on their knees afore hand in their Prayers and Devotions to God and Chriſt, and it is *ex accidenti*, as I may ſo ſpeak, that they are on their knees when they receive the holy ſymbols; So far are they from wittingly and conſcientiouſly directing any Religious Worſhip toward them: but the ſymbols are brought to them in ſuch a poſture as the Communicant is found in at his Devotions, whoſe face happily was not ſo much as derected to the Communion Table while he was at his Devotion, and his heart, as it is ſaid, *ſurſum corda*, wholly carryed to Heaven. This I confeſs is a pretty gird of my Adverſary, and a cunning juſtling me as it were againſt my own Church as much as he can; But it is manifeſt that what I have here delivered in this Concluſion is

agreeable enough with the Rites of our own Church, as well as with Truth it ſelf.

To the third I Anſwer, That my twentieth Concluſion is not truly recited. For my words run thus, *That Religious Incurvation toward a* bare *ſymbolical Preſence, wittingly and conſcientiouſly directed thither, &c.* He has left out the moſt emphatical word in the ſentence, *viz.* [*bare*]. And hence you ſee how unſeaſonable his Parentheſis is, [without exception of any] For when I reſtrain my Aſſertion to *bare* ſymbolical Preſences, it is evident that I except thoſe that are covered and concealed from the eyes of the people; As the Cherubins were on the Ark of the Covenant. So that it was a great overſight, to ſay no worſe, in my Adverſary to leave out that Monoſyllabon which was of ſuch principal ſignification in the ſentence. But it being in, as it was manifeſtly in and before his eyes, in the Concluſion he pretends to confute, this twentieth Concluſion is no contradiction at all to the ſixteenth. All Religious Incurvation towards a bare ſymbolical Preſence is Idolatry, ſays this twentieth Concluſion: But does the ſixteenth ſay, Not all Religious Incurvation toward a bare ſymbolical Preſence is Idolatry? It ſays no ſuch thing. But does onely imply that ſome ſymbolical Preſence may be bowed towards without Idolatry, as that over the Ark of the Covenant, it being not bare or open, but hid from the eyes of the people; nor yet that bowed to as to an Object neither, but onely as a circumſtance of Worſhip. Let the Reader judge how heedleſly at leaſt, if not diſingenuouſly,

genuouſly, my Adverſary has dealt with me in this aſſault, and withall how firmly and clearly I have maintained my own.

His Anſwer to the two and twentieth Concluſion.

My twenty firſt he gives here no bruſh againſt. Of the two following he ſpeaks thus. The twenty ſecond, and twenty third Concluſions weakly cavil at the adoration of the Hoſt as Idolatrous, either in Catholicks or Proteſtants. But theſe petty Nibblers at the moſt bleſſed and ever adorable Sacrament, ſhall have their Anſwer in the next Chapter, when the Doctor treats of this ſubject ex profeſſo,

The Reply.

His Anſwer is marveilous lofty and full of deſpiciency towards his Antagoniſt, and all of his mind. But I do not impute this ſo much to the pride of my Adverſary as to his cunning and prudence, that he may by this Scheme of confidence keep his Parties devotions warm to the adoration of the moſt bleſſed and ever adorable Sacrament, as he phraſes it: And we indeed will alſo acknowledge the conſecrated bread, an holy and bleſſed ſymbol of the body of Chriſt, but we adore onely our Celeſtial Lord and King, who ſits at the right hand of his Father in glory; and take it as a great reproach done to him, that thoſe of the *Romiſh* Religion ſhould pretend that

a morsel of Bread or a Wafer, after a few words of the Priest should become this Lord of glory. And meaner and more petty Nibblers than we, even those small and contemptible Animals, ordinarily called Mice, offer such an Argument against so grand an Absurdity as may well puzzle the subtilest of your School-Divines, *viz.* How this consecrated Host, if it be Christ himself in his own Body and Person, should suffer himself to be eaten up by a Mouse: You will say, that the Mouse onely eats up the species or external shew of a Body not any real Body at all, and that though Christ be contented to go along with the species when Men eat the Sacrament, yet if a Mouse light on it, as soon as she nibbles at it he slips out of the way. I must confess I know no other subter-fuge but this.

But this seems to me a meer shift, Nor do I think that any will deny, but that if the Mouses stomach were searched presently after she has eaten this consecrated Bread, that the Bread, or call it the species, will be found there, and certainly endewed with such Attributes as are the specifick Attributes of Body, that is with *Divisibility* and *Impenetrability*, which being the essential and specifick Difference whereby Body is Body, it is plain, that what they call species is really a Body or substance; but the Body or substance of the Bread is transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, therefore it is evident that the Body of Christ is in the belly of the Mouse, if Transubstantiation be true. Which plain consideration, methinks, might be sufficient

to awaken any one that is not in a very dead sleep or incurable Lethargy out of all conceit that a consecrated Wafer does become Personally and Corporeally Christ himself. For if it be He, though he humbled himself indeed so very extraordinarily in the behalf of us Men, yet it is not at all credible, that he would make himself so vile and cheap as to suffer himself to be devoured by a Mouse.

And if this Argument chance to be less pleasing, yet the recalling it to my memory is to be imputed to the scornfull expressions of my Adversary, who makes us such petty Niblers in our argumentation; Whenas if he had not overlooked, in this lofty mood of his, my twenty first Conclusion, this twenty second could not but have appeared to him perfect demonstration, upon the supposal that Transubstantiation is but a conceit, and no solid Truth; which is the main Argument of the next Chapter.

His Answer to the twenty third Conclusion.

His present Answer to my twenty third is this, For Protestants indeed to adore the Sacrament who believe no Corporeal presence of Christ there, would be a like Crime, as for an unconverted Jew to adore Jesus Christ in whom he believes not. But what is this to the Doctors purpose.

The

The Reply.

My Antagoniſt here acknowledges it a great ſin, even a Crime in a Proteſtant to adore the Sacrament, as well as for the Jew to adore Jeſus Chriſt, when he does not believe on him. Let me then here note by the by, how great a Crime it is in them, who as much as in them lyes, force men to commit ſo great a ſin by their unchriſtian Perſecutions. But I would ask further what Crime it is that the Jew and Proteſtant here commit. Certainly the Jew's can be no leſs then Idolatry in the internal, being that he has aſſented to the practiſe of what he thinks in his own Conſcience is Idolatry, the giving of Divine Worſhip to a meer Creature. And ſo much at leaſt is true of the Proteſtant that adores the Sacrament, But the Sacrament being not Chriſt, he is alſo guilty of Idolatry in the compleateſt Circumſtances, and becomes an Idolater as well in the external as internal Act.

And if you ask what this is to the Doctors purpoſe; he will tell you, that his purpoſe is to perſwade all men as much as he can to deal uprightly and not to diſſemble. So that it is an intimation to as many as are not perſwaded of Tranſubſtantiation, that they would not abuſe themſelves in communicating in your ſervice, they not being able to do it without apparent Idolatry.

His

His Anſwer to the twenty fifth Concluſion.

To the twenty fourth he Anſwered above, where you have alſo my Reply. To this twenty fifth or laſt, he onely ſays, touching my Objection there raiſed and Anſwered, that he will leave the Doctor to the pleaſure of his own thoughts, raiſing his airy Caſtle with one hand, and beating it down with another.

The Reply.

To which my Reply is onely this, let the Reader ſeriouſly peruſe this my laſt Concluſion, and conſider whether the Objection I raiſe be not material, and whether the ſolution thereof be not ſolid. And let him alſo impartially judge if I have not, though briefly, yet very clearly and perſpicuouſly ſhowed the Invalidity of all my Antagoniſts Objections againſt the Concluſions of theſe two firſt Chapters of my Antidote. We proceed now to the third.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

That the Romaniſts *worſhip the Hoſt with the higheſt kind of worſhip, even that of* Latria, *according to the Injunction of the Council of* Trent; *and that it is moſt groſs Idolatry ſo to do.*

1. AND having thus clearly and diſtinctly evinced and declared what is or ought to be held Idolatry amongſt Chriſtians; let us at length take more full notice of ſome Particulars wherein, according to theſe Determinations, the Church of *Rome* will be manifeſtly found guilty of Idolatry, and that according to the very Definitions of their own Council of *Trent*. As firſt, in the Point of the Adoration of the Hoſt, touching which the very words of the Council are, *Latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic ſanctiſſimo Sacramento in veneratione eſſe adhibendum:* and again, *Si quis dixerit, in ſancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento* Chriſtum *non eſſe cultu Latriæ etiam externo, adorandum, & ſolenniter circumgeſtandum populóque proponendum publicè ut adoretur, Anathema ſit.*

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 3. cap. 5. Can. 6.

2. This confident Injunction of groſs Idolatry, as it is certainly ſuch, is built upon their confidence of the truth of their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. For the Chapter of the Adoration of the Hoſt ſucceeds that of Tranſubſtantiation, as a natural, or rather neceſſary, Inference therefrom. *Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur*, &c. That is to ſay, The Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation being eſtabliſhed, there is no Scruple left touching the Adoration of the Hoſt, or giving Divine Worſhip to the Sacrament (or *Chriſt*, as it is there called,)

led,) when it is carried about, and expoſed publickly in Proceſſions to the view of the people.

But the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation being falſe, it muſt needs follow, that the giving of Divine Worſhip to the Hoſt is as groſs a piece of Idolatry as ever was committed by any of the Heathens. For then their Divine Worſhip, even their *Cultus Latriæ*, which is onely due to the onely-true God, is exhibited to a meer Creature, and that a very ſorry one too; and therefore muſt be groſs Idolatry, by the twenty-firſt and twenty-ſecond Concluſions of the ſecond Chapter.

3. But now, that their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is falſe, after we have propoſed it in the very words of the Council, we ſhall evince by undeniable Demonſtration. *Per conſecrationem Panis & Vini converſionem fieri totius ſubſtantiæ Panis in ſubſtantiam Corporis* Chriſti, *& totius ſubſtantiæ Vini in ſubſtantiam Sanguinis ejus; quæ converſio convenienter & propriè à Sancta Catholica Eccleſia Tranſubſtantiatio eſt appellata.* And a little before, cap 3. *Si quis negaverit in venerabili Sacramento Euchariſtiæ ſub unaquaque ſpecie, & ſub ſingulis cujuſque ſpeciei partibus, ſeparatione factâ, totum* Chriſtum *contineri, Anathema ſit.* In which paſſages it is plainly affirmed, that not onely the Bread is turned into the whole Body of *Chriſt*, and the Wine into his Bloud, but that each of them are turned into the whole Body of *Chriſt*, and every part of each, as often as diviſion or ſeparation is made, is alſo turned into his whole Body. Which is ſuch a contradictious Figment, that there is nothing ſo repugnant to the Faculties of the humane Soul.

Concil. Trident. *Seſſ.* 3. *cap.* 4. *cap.* 3. *can.* 3.

4. For thus the Body of *Chriſt* will be in God knows how many thouſand places at once, and how many thouſand miles diſtant one from another. Whenas *Amphitruo* rightly expoſtulates with his Servant *Soſia*, and rates him for a Mad-man or Impoſtour, that he would go about

to

to make him believe that he was at home, though but a little way off, while yet he was with him at that diſtance from home. *Quo id (malúm!) pacto poteſt fieri nunc ut tu hîc ſis, & domi?* And a little before, in the ſame Colloquie with his Servant, *Nemo unquam homo vidit*, ſaith he, *nec poteſt fieri, tempore uno homo idem duobus locis ut ſimul ſit.* Wherein *Amphitruo* ſpeaks but according to the common ſenſe and apprehenſion of all men, even of the meaneſt Idiots.

5. But now let us examine it according to the Principles of the learned, and of all their Arts and Sciences, *Phyſicks*, *Metaphyſicks*, *Mathematicks* and *Logick*. It is a Principle in *Phyſicks*, That that internal ſpace that a Body occupies at one time is equal to the Body that occupies it. Now let us ſuppoſe one and the ſame body occupy two ſuch internal places or ſpaces at once; This Body is therefore equal o thoſe two ſpaces, which are double to one ſi gle ſpace; wherefore the body is double to that body in one ſingle ſpace, and therefore one and the ſame body double to it ſelf. Which is an enormous Contradiction.

Again, in *Metaphyſicks*; The Body of *Chriſt* is acknowledged one, and that as much as any one body elſe in the world. Now the Metaphyſical Notion of *one* is, to be *indiviſum à ſe*, (both *quoad partes* and *quoad totum*,) as well as *diviſum à quolibet alio*. But the Body of *Chriſt* being both in Heaven, and without any continuance of that body, here upon Earth alſo, the whole body is divided from the whole body, and therefore is entirely both *unum* and *multa*: which is a perfect Contradiction.

6, Thirdly, in *Mathematicks*; The Council ſaying that in the ſeparation of the parts of the *Species*, (that which bears the outward ſhow of Bread or Wine,) that from this Diviſion there is a parting of the whole, divided into ſo many entire Bodies of *Chriſt*, the Body of

of *Chriſt* being always at the ſame time equal to it ſelf, it follows, that a part of the Diviſion is equal to the whole, againſt that common Notion in *Euclide*, That the Whole is bigger then the Part.

And, laſtly, in *Logick* it is a Maxime, That the Parts agree indeed with the Whole, but diſagree one with another. But in the aboveſaid Diviſion of the Hoſt or Sacrament the Parts do ſo well agree, that they are entirely the very ſame individual thing. And whereas any Diviſion, whether *Logical* or *Phyſical*, is the Diviſion of ſome one into many; this is but the Diviſion of one into one and it ſelf, like him that for brevity ſake divided his Text into one Part.

To all which you may add, that, unleſs we will admit of two *Soſia's* and two *Amphitruo's* in that ſenſe that the mirth is made with it in *Plautus* his Comedy, neither the Bread nor the Wine can be tranſubſtantiated into the intire Body of *Chriſt*. For this implies that the ſame thing is, and is not, at the ſame time. For that individual thing that can be, and is to be made of any thing, is not. Now the individual Body of *Chriſt* is to be made of the Wafer conſecrated, for it is turned into his individual Body. But his individual Body was before this Conſecration. Wherefore it was, and it was not, at the ſame time. Which is againſt that fundamental Principle in *Logick* and *Metaphyſicks*, That both parts of a Contradiction cannot be true; or, That the ſame thing cannot both be, and not be, at once.

Thus fully and intirely contradictious and repugnant to all Senſe and Reaſon, to all indubitable Principles of all Art and Science, is this Figment of Tranſubſtantiation; and therefore moſt certainly falſe. Read the ten firſt Concluſions of the brief Diſcourſe of *the true Grounds of Faith*, added to the *Divine Dialogues*.

7. And from Scripture it has not the leaſt ſupport. All is, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, when *Chriſt* held the Bread in

in his hand, and after put part into his * own mouth, (as well as diſtributed it to his Diſciples:) in doing whereof he ſwallow'd his whole Body down his throat at once, according to the Doctrine of this Council, or at leaſt might have done ſo, if he would. And ſo all the Body of *Chriſt*, Fleſh, Bones, Mouth, Teeth, Hair, Head, Heels, Thighs, Arms, Shoulders, Belly, Back, and all, went through his Mouth into his Stomach; and thus all were in his Stomach, though all his Body intirely, his Stomach excepted, was ſtill without it. Which let any one judge whether it be more likely, then that this ſaying of *Chriſt*, *This is my Body*, is to be underſtood figuratively; the uſing the Verb ſubſtantive in this ſenſe being not unuſual in Scripture; as in, *I am the Vine*; *The ſeven lean Kine are the ſeven years of Famine*; and the like: and more particularly, ſince our Saviour, ſpeaking elſewhere of eating his fleſh and drinking his bloud, ſays plainly, (*Joh. 6. 63.*) that *the words he ſpake, they were ſpirit, and they were truth*, that is to ſay, a ſpiritual or ænigmatical truth, not carnally and literally to be underſtood.

* See *Paul. Fag.* upon Deut. 8 10.

John 15 5. Gen. 41. 27.

And for the truſting of the judgement of the *Roman* Church herein, that makes it ſelf ſo ſacroſanct and infallible, the Pride, Worldlineſs, Policy and multifarious Impoſtures of that Church, ſo often and ſo ſhameleſly repeated and practiſed, muſt needs make their Authority ſeem nothing in a Point that is ſo much for their own Intereſt, eſpecially ſet againſt the undeniable Principles of common Senſe and Reaſon, and of all the Arts and Sciences God has illuminated the Mind of man withall. Conſider the twelfth Concluſion of the abovenamed Treatiſe, together with the other ten before cited. Wherefore any one that is not a meer Bigott may be as aſſured that Tranſubſtantiation is a meer Figment or enormous Falſehood,

Falſehood, as of any thing elſe in the whole world.

8. From whence it will unavoidably follow and themſelves cannot deny it, that they are moſt groſs and palpable Idolaters, and conſequently moſt barbarous Murtherers, in killing the innocent Servants of God for not ſubmitting to the ſame Idolatries with themſelves. *Coſterus* the *Jeſuite* ſpeaks expreſly to this Point, (and conſonantly, I think, to the Suppoſitions of the Council) *viz.* That if their Church be miſtaken in the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, they *ipſo facto* ſtand guilty of ſuch a piece of Idolatry as never was before ſeen or known of in the world.

For the errours of thoſe, ſaith he, *were more tolerable who worſhip ſome golden or ſilver Statue, or ſome Image of any other Materials, for their God, as the Heathen worſhipped their Gods; or a rod Cloth hung upon the top of a Spear, as is reported of the* Laplanders; *or ſome live Animal, as of old the* Ægyptians *did; then of theſe that worſhip a bit of Bread, as hitherto the Chriſtians have done all over the world for ſo many hundred years, if the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be not true.* Franciſc. Coſter. *Enchirid. Controv. cap.* 12.

What can be a more full and expreſs acknowledgement of the groſs Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* then this, if Tranſubſtantiation prove an Errour? Then which notwithſtanding there is nothing in the world more certain to all the Faculties of a man; as is manifeſt out of what has been here ſaid. And therefore the *Romaniſts* muſt be groſs Idolaters, from the ſecond, third, fourth, ſeventh and ninth Concluſions of the firſt Chapter, and from the fourth, fifth, eighth, ninth, twenty firſt, twenty-ſecond and twenty-fifth of the ſecond Chapter. All theſe Concluſions will give evidence againſt them, that they are very notorious Idolaters.

9. And therefore this being ſo high and ſo palpable a ſtrain of Idolatry in them touching the Euchariſt, or the

eating the Body and drinking the Bloud of *Christ*, wherein *Christ* is offered by the Priest as an Oblation, and the People feed upon him as in a Feast upon a Sacrifice, which is not done without Divine Adoration done to the Host, according to the precept of their Church; This does hugely confirm our sense of the eating of things offered unto Idols in the Epistles to the Churches in *Pergamus* and in *Thyatira*, this worshipping of the Host being so expresly acknowledged by the Pope and his Clergy, and in that high sense of *Cultus Latriæ*, which is due to God alone. And therefore it is very choicely and judiciously perstringed by the Spirit of Prophecy above any other Modes of their Idolatry, it being such a gross and confessed *Specimen* thereof, and such as there is no Evasion for or Excuse.

Hoc teneas vultus mutantem Protea *nodo.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

His Anſwer to the firſt Paragraph.

It had been ingenuous in the Doctor whileſt he ſtates Catholick Doctrine to ſpeak Catholick language. The Council of Trent *(even as quoted by himſelf) mentions not the Hoſt but onely the Adoration of the Bleſſed Sacrament or (which is the ſame) of Jeſus Chriſt in the Sacrament. Which is a quite different thing from that uncatholick expreſſion of worſhipping the Hoſt: For Catholick Principles own nothing of the Hoſt to remain after Conſecration, but the ſpecies or ſymbols. Nor does the Council enjoyn the Worſhip of* Latria *to the ſymbols but to Jeſus Chriſt veiled with theſe ſymbols.*

The Reply.

THis Anſwer is moſt what but a λογομαχία or ſtrife about words. Whether it be called Hoſt or Sacrament, it is all one to me, and to the Cauſe I undertake. For by the Hoſt I mean the conſecrated Bread, and it is familiar in common ſpeech to underſtand the Hoſt in that ſenſe. As when they ſay, At the elevation of the Hoſt, and, As the Hoſt paſſes by, and the like, which is underſtood of the Sacrament, as my Adverſary here had rather have it called. Beſides that, the very Reaſon of the name implies ſo much, that it is the

Conſecrated Bread; becauſe *Hoſtia*, from whence the word *Hoſt* is, ſignifies a Sacrifice; Which your Church will not grant the Bread to be before Conſecration, whereby you conceive it to become Chriſt himſelf. And laſtly *Durandus*, and I doubt not but many others of your Church, do call the Sacrament it ſelf *Hoſtia* very often. So that there is more of pomp then ſolidity in this rebuke, and a cunning endeavour to make me ſeem leſs skilfull in theſe Points of Controverſie in the eyes of your Party.

But now to the Second part of your Anſwer which ſeems more material, That the Council enjoyns not the Worſhip of *Latria* to the ſymbols, but to Jeſus Chriſt veiled with the Symbols: I Reply, That for as much as they enjoyn adoration or bowing to this effigiated bare or viſible ſymbolical Preſence of Chriſt inviſibly there, it is Idolatry by Concluſion 20th. Chapter 2. And though they pretend to omit the external ſpecies or ſhew of the Bread in their Worſhip; yet while it is acknowledged that they Worſhip Chriſt as Hypoſtatically united with the ſubſtance of the Bread not annihilated but changed and tranſubſtantiated into his body there veiled with theſe Species, and being this Tranſubſtantiation is not, this *Latria* of theirs is turned into Idolatry by the twenty firſt, twenty ſecond, and twenty fifth Concluſions of the ſecond Chapter. As it is manifeſt to any one that liſts to compare the Caſe with theſe Concluſions, which ſtand very firm ſtill, for any thing he has been able to alledge againſt them.

After

After this my Adverſary gives a brief ſum of this third Chapter of mine in this Enthymeme, *Tranſubſtantiation is a meer Figment*; Ergo, *The adoration of the Euchariſt is palpable Idolatry*, and ſo runs out prepoſterouſly to the eighth Paragraph, in Anſwer to the concealed Propoſition of the Enthymeme. But I will rather ſet his Anſwers in the ſame order that the numbers of the Paragraphs require. And ſo his Anſwers to the Antecedent of the Propoſition will come in view firſt. We will conſider his Anſwer to the conſequence of it, at the eight Paragraph which is its due place.

His Anſwer to the Argument in the fourth Paragraph.

To this he Anſwers, This is indeed a fair demonſtration that Dr. More *is acquainted with* Plautus *his Comedies, and can when he pleaſes deſcend from the Divinity-chair to a piece of unſeaſonable mirth and ſtage Drollery. But let this paſs as a pleaſant skirmish before the main charge.*

The Reply.

If it was not indecorous for St. *Paul* to quote Heathen Poets, as *Aratus* and *Epimenides*, yea Comedians as *Menander* in his *Thais*, how can it be below ſuch an one as I to quote a Comick Poet, not in any point of Drollery, but for an earneſt aſſeveration, *That it never was ſeen nor is it poſſible that one body can be in two places at once.* But if this Teſtimony

does not like you, you may remember how I shewed you above, That *Athanasius* and *Anastatius* ancient Christians declare, that not an Angel himself, nor a Soul separate can be in two places at once. But the stress of my Argument lyes not in the Authority of *Plautus*, but in the sense of all mankind as I have intimated, who by common suffrage, unless infinitely prejudiced, do ratifie this truth, *That one body cannot be in two places at once.* Which distinct force of this my first Argument my Adversary endeavoured to smother, by a Rhetorical flourish, and nimble-paced Transition to those fetched from Arts and Sciences, &c. To which you shall now hear his Answers.

His Answer to the Argument from *Physicks* in the fifth Paragraph.

To this he Answers, First, by asserting it possible, That a Body occupying a space equal to it self in one place, may yet be elsewhere without occupying any place at all; and he would prove this more then possible, from the opinion of the Learned, who maintain that actually the supreme Heaven occupies no place. Secondly, by denying the Inferences I make from the supposition of one Body being in two places at once, as first, That the Body will be equal to those two spaces. What needs that, Mr. Doctor, says he, It is enough that in each of those two spaces it be onely equal or commensurate to that determinate place it there occupies, suppose of six cubits, and in neither of them equal or commensurate to a

space

space of twelve Cubits. And then for my Inference, That granting this Body equal to the spaces it occupies at once, it will be double to it self, he denies the consequence. Because a Body of one Cubit rarefied into a double dimension, and therefore occupying a double space, will not be double to it self. And a rational Soul informing a Body of a span length, when the Body is grown to another span still informed by the same Soul, it does not follow that the Soul is double to it self. Is not this rare Divinity, says he. Let the Doctor show a material disparity in these two Cases, or else acknowledge the unconclusiveness of his own Objection. This is the sum and substance of that wherewith he would enervate my Argument, drawn from Physicks *against Transubstantiation. What follows belongs rather to his Answer to my Argument drawn from* Metaphysicks *which we shall consider there.*

The Reply.

In the mean time to his first Answer, I Reply thus, That it is a fetch beyond the Moon or rather beyond the World, to endeavour the enervation of my Consequences from the supposal of a Body in two internal places at once, that it so filling those two places, is equal to the two places equal to one another, and that therefore it is double to it self; by saying, that a Body occupying a place equal to it self in one place, may yet be elsewhere without being in any place, because the supreme or extimate Heaven is in no

place; which yet is to be understood of no external place. But *Eustachius* and other School-Philosophers, and all that hold an internal place (which Truth is plainly demonstrable) do hold that it is in a place internal, upon which our Argument goes, but is equally true of *locus externus*. Nor then will this high flight beyond the supreme or extimate Heaven serve for any evasion. For as much as we speak of Bodies placed on this side of the extimate Heaven, and no Body can be found amongst Bodies, but it will be circumscribed by the ambient superficies of the next Bodies about it, that superficies of the ambient Bodies that do immediately compass the environ'd Body being its place. And every Body will have such a place that is found on this side the extimate Heaven. This is a Truth that cannot be denied. And our Question is instituted onely of such Bodies as are on this side the extimate Heaven. From which the unseasonableness of my Adversaries subterfuge is plainly discerned, which in no sense will serve his turn, unless for the amuzing the minds of the People.

To the Second Answer I return this; To the first part thereof, That it is not onely enough to him but it is also enough to me that in each of the two spaces the Body be equal to that determinate place it there occupies, understanding either an internal or external place. For suppose one and the same Body at each place at once fills either an internal or external place of such

such a quantity, of six Cubits suppose, which it cannot fill unless it be commensurate to them, it is plain it fills as much space as comes to twelve Cubits, if six and six make twelve, which is as sure as two and two make four. And therefore that it is equal to twelve Cubits, because it plainly fills up the space of twice six Cubits. Or how ever at the same time fills the ambient superficieses that would exactly fit twice six Cubits in several. There is no greater demonstration of equality then this, which the Geometricians call ἐφαρμογὴ, or *Congruentia*. So certain is it that a Body adequately filling two places of six Cubits big at once, has it self the magnitude of twelve Cubits: But the Body is supposed but one and the same Body in both places, and therefore can be but six Cubits. Wherefore it is both six Cubits and twelve Cubits at once, that is to say, it is double to it self at the same time, which is impossible.

Nor does the Second part of my Adversaries Answer evade this Impossibility: That it will no more follow that a Body occupying at the same time two places, and so being equal to those two places, which are double to one single place, that the Body is double to it self, then that a Body of one Cubit rarified into a double dimension and therefore occupying a double space is double to it self: Or the rational Soul informing a Body of a span length at first, but after the same Body grown another span, is thereby

double

double to it ſelf. For not at all to quarrel with the miſtake of the nature of Rarefaction, which I muſt confeſs I take to be the *Carteſian* way not the *Ariſtotelean*, and candidly interpreting his meaning, in thoſe words, (a body of a ſpan length and then grown up to another ſpan) which grown up to another ſpan naturally implies the Body not double but octuple to what it was before, paſſing by theſe and medling onely with his own meaning, (as it may be hoped) and Hypotheſes, the examples do not at all reach the preſent purpoſe. For ſpeaking in his ſenſe, a body of one Cubit rarified into a double dimenſion is double to it ſelf unrarified; that is, It is as big again as it was when it was unrarified. But it is not as big again or double to it ſelf at the ſame time, but double it is to what it was before. And the ſame is to be ſaid of the ſoul, (in ſuch a ſenſe as extenſion is applicable to her, and increaſe or decreaſe of it, namely by dilatation and contraction Spiritual) that it is double when the Body is grown as big again as it was when it was but a ſpan long, to what it was when the Body was but a ſpan long. But here in the preſent Caſe a Body is demonſtrated double to it ſelf, compared with it ſelf and its preſent condition at the ſame time: Which is impoſſible, *viz.* That the ſame Body ſhould be double now to what it is now. That it now ſhould be as big again as it ſelf is now. For neither can the Soul her ſelf be ſaid to be now as wiſe again as ſhe is now, but onely as wiſe again as ſhe was ſome time ago. And ſo my Adverſaries

Adversaries Answer does not at all reach the point in hand. And therefore my Demonstration stands firm and unshaken, of the Impossibility of Transubstantiation from this Argument taken from *Physicks*, as any unprejudiced eye may easily discern. Nor had we any need here to consider the continuity or discontinuity of places. But all is clear from what we have thus briefly represented.

His Answer to the Argument from *Metaphysicks* in this fifth Paragraph.

To my Metaphysical Argument that infers, that the Body of Christ will be Divisum à se, *and both* Unum *and* Multa. *First he Answers to the first part; If* divisum à se secundum substantiam, *I deny it, If* divisum à se quoad locum, transeat. *To the Second, That it will not be* Unum & Multa, *but onely* Unum in Multis, *one and the same in many places.*

His second Answer is, that I go upon a false supposition, That essential Unity is derived from the Unity of local Presence, not from the Intrinsick Principles of the subject. For unless this be granted, Plurality of local Presence at once will not prove a thing divided from it self.

His last Answer is, That by this and my former Argument I put armes into the hands of Infidels against the Mystery of the Holy Trinity. For it will follow, saith he, That one and the same Divine Nature being in three distinct Persons at once, the same Nature will be treble to it self, as much as the same

same Body being in two places at once will be double to it self. And secondly, that one Divine Nature being in three distinct Persons it will be as much Divisa à se *(besides that it will not be* Divisa ab aliis, *viz. from the three distinct Persons with which it is really identified) as a Body will by being in two distinct places at once. This is the bare edge and full strength of his Answers against my* Metaphysical *Argument. As for his Rhetorical Flourishes and Boasts, they are no part of any proof, and I list not to meddle with such things.*

The Reply.

To the First part of his first Answer I Reply, That it is plain that it is *divisum à se secundum substantiam,* both *quoad totum,* and *quoad partes,* because it is separate or distant so many yards or so many miles suppose from it self, nothing of it self being between. As distant and separate as two several Individual Bodies at the same distance, that is to say, A is as many yards or miles distant from A *quoad integram suam substantiam,* as to its intire substance, as B is from C. But B is really distant or separate from C suppose twenty yards or miles, as to their intire substances. *Ergo,* A is distant or separate from A twenty yards or miles as to its intire substance, nothing of its substance being between. So that it is both present with it self and absent from it self at the same time twenty miles, and may be many thousands according

cording to this impossible Hypothesis. In so much that it is plain this part of his Answer is weak and insufficient. To the other part I say, That it manifestly follows from my former Reply, (that shows plainly that A is distant and separate from A which is a plain and palpable Division of A wholly and intirely from it self) That A is not *Ens unum*, but *Entia multa* or *plura*, because the very definition of *Ens unum* is, that it be *indivisum à se*. This is perfect demonstration to any ones whose eyes are not obstructed with prejudice.

And now to his Second Answer, I deny that I go upon any such supposition, That Essential Unity is derived from the unity of local Presence. But what I contend for is this, That unity of local Presence is a necessary consequence of Essential Unity: Nor can any finite Essential Unity be in any more than one place at once, as *Athanasius* and *Anastatius* also have concluded. And there may be as necessary and indubitable reasonings from the property of a thing as from its intrinsick Principles. As a man may as certainly conclude such a Triangle to be a Rectangle Triangle from the equality of the Power of the *Hypotenusa* to the Powers of the sides including the Angle subtended by the *Hypotenusa*, as from the very definition of a Rectangle Triangle it self. And though the *ubi* of a Being be not essential to it, yet we are sure what ever is is some where, *& quod nusquam est nihil est*. From whence it is apparent how weak my Adversaries Inference is, That unless

unless essential Unity be derived from the Unity of local Presence, it will not follow that the same Body being in divers places at once is divided from it self, any more than it is divided from its intrinsick Principles, which it can never be by Plurality of local Presence, they being wholly extrinsick to the subject. Which is the same as if he should contend that a Man may be and yet be no where, because *Ubi* or Place is extrinsecal to him. Or that his Soul may be neither wiser, nor less wise, nor equally wise with others; or his Body neither taller, nor less tall, nor equally tall with others, and yet be, these being onely external respects and comparisons, and not in the definition or essential constitution of a Man. To all which I add, That the very intrinsick Principles of any one Being supposed to be in two Places are divided from themselves, that is, are distant or separate so many Yards or Miles, as is plain from my former Arguing. As suppose *Plato* were at the same time at *Athens* and *Thebes*, the intrinsick Principles of *Plato*, to wit, his Soul and Body would be both divided from themselves at this distance, and constitute two *Plato's*. These things are so plain, that it is a wonder to me that they can be hid from any Mans eyes, that does not wilfully wink against them; or rather that any Man can wink against them, though in humour or for ends best known to himself he may talk against them.

Now to his third and last I Answer; Who does the greater disservice to the Catholick Church he or I? I dealing *bonâ fide* and plainly demonstrating that

that to be an errour that cannot be hid from the unprejudiced, it being in a subject so easily comprehensible to all mens perceptions, I mean the nature of a Body, and the impossibility of what they pronounce thereof. And it being an Opinion unknown or disown'd by the Fathers of the Church, I mean this Opinion of Transubstantiation, not avowed by any Council till about four or five hundred Years ago, when as the Doctrine of the Trinity was repeatedly ratified in the Primitive times by general Councils above 1200 Years ago, with what reason is it that my Adversary will allow no greater certainty of the Mystery of the Trinity then of Transubstantiation, which has such palpable and easily deprehensible and plainly demonstrable contradictions in it. Is not this to put weapons into the hands of Infidels with a witness? But I hope I shall easily wrest them out again by a sufficient Reply to this third Answer of my Adversary.

In the First part therefore, I say, his supposition is very gross and incompetible to the *Divine Nature*. As if it were in the three Persons as one hand phancyed in three distinct distanced gloves at once, or one finger in three distinct finger-stalls filling them out in several with its presence, whenas the Divine Nature and the Persons are promiscuously said to be in one another, (*John* 17. 21.) *I in thee, and thou in me*; And Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity. *Peter Lumbard* not unskilfully resembles the Trinity and Divine Nature, to the Mind and the three Powers in the Mind, Memory,

Memory, and Understanding, and Love, or Will. These three, saith he, out of St. *Austin*, are not three Lives but one Life, not three Minds but one Mind, one Essence. He descants further on this Similitude, but it is enough to hint thus much, that from hence also it is manifest, That the Divine Nature is not in the three Persons, as one finger that fits three distinct distanced finger-stalls, but as the Memory, Understanding, and Will, are adequately every-where where the Mind is by a *Metaphysical* Coincidency and Congruity, so also is the Presence of the three Persons and Divine Nature every where coincident and adequate: Nor is the Divine Nature any more repeated according to the number of Persons, then the Essence of the Soul is according to the number of those *three Powers*, *Memory*, *Understanding*, and *Will*. So that nothing more can be concluded then thus, That the number of the Persons are triple to the Divine Nature which is but One, as the Powers of the Soul or Mind are triple to the Soul or Mind that is but One. And what inconvenience is there in this? Do not all Men say, that there are three Persons though but One Divine Nature? But he would bring a thick Night upon Truth, that gross Errour also might find harbour under that Covert.

In the second part of his Answer there seems also to be a supposition as Uncatholick and false as the former. As if the *Divine Nature* in the three Divine Persons were as One common general *Humane Nature* in three Men, suppose *Pythagoras*, *Plato*,

Plato, and *Socrates*; when as according to St. *Auſtin* and others, The Divine Nature is to the three Divine Perſons rather as the Rational Soul or Mind to the three Powers, *Memory*, *Underſtanding*, and *will*: This is as near as in this imperſcrutable Myſtery we can come, ſpeaking in a Parable with that ancient Father. And we muſt ſay ſo rather than acknowledge any ſimilitude with that of the common humane nature in *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, and *Socrates*, leaſt we run into that dreadfull abſurdity of making more Gods than One. But now ſpeaking according to the ſenſe of St. *Auſtin*, it is plain that that One Divine Nature being not in the three Perſons as one general humane nature in three Men, but the Union and mutual inexiſtence being as that of the Soul and her Powers, it is plain I ſay, that that One Divine Nature will be no more divided from it ſelf by being thus inexiſtent in the three Perſons, than the Soul will be divided from her ſelf by reaſon of her three Powers, *Memory*, *Underſtanding*, and *Will*, or *Mens*, *Notitia & Amor*, or *Sapientia & Amor*, which *Peter Lumbard* contends to be the proper titles of the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*; which alſo is very conſonant to the doctrine of the ancient Philoſophy of the Jews and Greeks touching their Trinity. And laſtly as the Soul is ſufficiently *diviſa ab aliis* in a Metaphyſical ſenſe, though ſhe be really identified with her three Powers, ſo is the *Divine Nature* ſufficiently *diviſa ab aliis* though it be identified really with the three Perſons. So that my Adverſary does here *nodum in ſcirpo quærere* out of an ill will

to the clearneſs of my Arguments which he would thus obliquely obſcure, and teach the Infidel to cavil againſt the ſolid Myſtery of the Trinity, becauſe neither himſelf nor any elſe can make good that falſe Opinion of *Tranſubſtantiation.* Which how pious and warrantable an act of him it is, let any man judge. This is onely to caſt duſt into the eyes of the Vulgar to diſhearten them from endeavouring to ſee the Truth.

His Anſwer to the Argument from *Mathematicks* in the ſixth *Paragraph*

This Argument is meer Cob-web ſtuff, half an eye may look through it; For theſe words of the Doctor, (That a part of the Diviſion is equal to the whole) either refer to the ſpecies (and then it is falſe that a part of the Diviſion is equal to the whole) or they point at the Body of Chriſt (and then the words are de ſubjecto non ſupponente *) for there is no diviſion of any part of Chriſts Body from the whole.*

The Reply.

I will not ſay, That my Adverſary looks through too thick a Cob-web to diſcern the force and ſcope of my Argument. But this I will ſay, that he has plainly miſſed it. For the very abſurdity that I drive at is, that in dividing ſuppoſe an entire conſecrated Hoſt into two parts, (in which one entire conſecrated Hoſt there is but one continued Body of

of Chriſt, veiled as he ſays, but co-extended with the ſpecies) that in the dividing this Hoſt or ſpecies of the Hoſt if you will, that one continued Body of Chriſt there before, is diſcontinued and ſeparated into two as ſure as it is in two places at once. And what, I pray you, is this but to be divided into two? And being Diviſion here is into two intirely the ſame with the divided, what is it but to be divided into parts of a Diviſion which ſingly are equal to the whole, contrary to that common Notion in *Euclid*? Or if you think this leſs abſurd, to be divided into two wholes? For they may be called either, in ſuch an Hypotheſis, as brings in the confuſion of all things.

His Anſwer to the Argument from *Logick* in this ſixth *Paragraph*.

This, ſays he, is the ſame in effect with the former and requires no new Anſwer. Becauſe theſe his trifling expreſſions if applied to the ſeparated ſpecies are falſe, if to Chriſts Body then they proceed upon a falſe ſuppoſition, as hath been declared in my Anſwer to the third Objection.

The Reply.

That this Argument ſtands upon the ſame ſuppoſition that the former, I grant, But that the ſuppoſition is falſe I may well deny, having proved it true in my Reply to his former Anſwer. Nor is this Argument altogether the ſame in

effect, because it illustrates the grand absurdity of the opinion it oppugns from new Maximes. So little trifling is the argumentation which I have here produced. But it is the Policy of my Antagonist to slight and make himself merry with such things as are too solid to be really Answered. For this is succedaneous to a real Confutation in the eyes of the Vulgar, and it may be of more consequence with them, that are taught not to examine but believe: In which Method he shows himself an egregious Artist in his attaque upon my next Objection, where he begins with some few *scoptical* and undervaluing *Reflections* as he calls them. But a Man of his parts and wit cannot but know that they are insignificant to any but the Vulgar, before whom he thinks it very conducing to seem to trample on his Antagonist right loftily acting his part as it were on a Stage.

His Reflections on some Passages in my Argument from that fundamental Principle in *Logick* and *Metaphysicks* in this sixth Paragraph, together with my Replies thereunto.

'First, saith he, a knowing Reader cannot chuse 'but smile to see (Can be) or a capacity of Being 'brought in for a piece of an Argument to prove that 'a thing is not. *That individual thing that can be*, 'saith the Doctor, *and is to be made of any thing, is not.* 'So my Adversary in his first Reflection. To which I Reply, That some knowing Reader it may be, may not onely smile but laugh quite out while he observes

ſerves to what pretty ſhifts my Adverſary is put, to make the Doctor, as he calls him, ſeem an old doting fool to the heedleſs and ignorant. For the knowing Reader will eaſily diſcern, that (That that can be) is not to be diſjoyned from the reſt of the ſentence, but that (made) is to be referred κατὰ κοινῆ to (be) in both places, and that the ſenſe is, (though the ſentence is then leſs ſuccinct and elegant) That that individual thing that can be made or is to be made of any thing, is not.

'But here he makes another oblique Reflection, 'and obſerves how fondly the Doctor playes the 'confident Dogmatizer aſſerting as evident, That 'that individual thing that can be and is to be made 'of any thing, is not; As if forſooth it were evidently 'demonſtrable, that that individual thing which is 'to day in actual being could not poſſibly be deſtroy-'ed and made anew again to morrow by a ſecond 'generation. *Reply*, This is a very oblique and diſtorted Reflection indeed and caſt off quite from the mark it ſhould aim at; nor does it at all *reſpicere Titulum*, the Argument in hand, which is our ever bleſſed Saviours Body never to be deſtroyed. So that this Anſwer is onely an argute Cavil. For my Antaniſt is not ſo ſhort ſighted but he could eaſily diſcern, that I underſtand the individual thing I ſpeak of to be ſuch a thing as being once made is not to be deſtroyed. And therefore to quit my ſelf of my Antagoniſts crafty Evaſions, I will mould my Propoſition into a conſiſtence more full and cloſe, that there may be no holes nor chinkes for a ſlippery wit to creep through, and ſhall argue thus,

That thing that once made is never to be destroyed, when ever it may be truely said of it, That it can be made and is to be made of any thing, it then is not. But the Body of Christ is a thing that once made to exist, is never to be destroyed. Therefore when ever it is truely to be said of it, That it can be made or is to be made of any thing, it then is not. But Transubstantiation even now says, That the Body of Christ can be made and is to be made of Bread or a Wafer consecrated; Therefore according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Body of Christ is not But we know certainly and both the Scripture and the Church Universal do testifie, that the Body of Christ is: Therefore if Transubstantiation be true, The Body of Christ both is and is not at the same time, against that *Logical* and *Metaphysical* Principle. *Idem non potest esse & non esse simul,* Is not this as clear as the Meridian Sun?

'But he has not done yet, To say the Body of 'Christ is to be made of the Consecrate Bread, is 'such an unhappy absurdity with my Antagonist, that 'he reflects on that in the third place even with the 'eye of pitty. It is pitty, says he, to observe his 'words in the next Proposition. *The individual Body 'of Christ is to be made of the Wafer consecrated.* 'Which implies as if the Wafer were the material 'cause of Christs Body. What Philosophy ever 'spake so Unphilosophically? *Reply,* Good lack! what Tragedies are here raised upon not an half-penny of harm done? If my Antagonist had but observed the many significations of τὸ ἐκ τινος εἶναι in *Aristotles*

Ariſtotles Metaphyſicks, he might eaſily have obſerved more ſignifications of ἐξ or *of*, than the Material cauſe. But he proceeds,

'Yet to make amends he immediately contra-'dicts himſelf and adds, That the Water is turn-'ed into his individual Body; which is a much 'different thing from being made of the Wafer, *Reply*, Water is turned into Ice or Cryſtal or into Wine by a Miracle, and Lead, by Chymical tranſmutation, into Gold; how much is that different, from Ice or Cryſtal and Wine being made of Water, and Gold of Lead?

'But the particle (for) ſaith he, goes beyond 'wonder. The individual Body of Chriſt is made 'of the Wafer Conſecrated (mark the word) *for* 'it is turned into his individual Body: Which is a 'piece of as Learned Non-ſenſe, as if he ſaid in 'open terms, Becauſe the Wafer is turned into 'Chriſts Body by a total Converſion, which ex-'cludes a Material cauſe, therefore his Body is 'made of the Wafer by generation, which requires 'a Material cauſe. Thus unfortunate are the Arts 'and Sciences when they ingage againſt Gods 'Church. *Reply*, Would not one think that in this high bluſter and ſwaggering language he had plainly proved his Antagoniſt a meer dotard in matters of Divinity? But let us reflect a little on the Reflecter, And firſt upon his Hyperbolical wonderment on the particle (for). Cryſtal is made of Water, for Water is turned into Cryſtal, Vineger made of Wine, for Wine is turned into Vineger, Gold ſometime made of Lead, for Lead ſometimes is

turned into Gold. Is the use of (for) in such cases as these so wonderfull? Or were it not a wonder if (for) were not used upon such occasions. And yet my Antagonist cannot abstain from calling it a piece of learned Non-sense; though not half so Learned as the making of a Child of two spans long, but double to the same Child when but one span long, which yet I had the candour gently to connive at. Nor do I understand any sense in this saying of my Antagonist, That a total conversion excludes the material Cause, if he will allow the matter to be such. For certainly the whole Bread includes the matter of the Bread as well as the form, and the form perishing, else it were Bread still, what remains but the matter of the Bread to be turned into the Body of Christ and to become formally and individually his Body. And whether this may be called generation or no is a λογομαχία. It is no such generation as is ordinarily seen in Nature, but being it is such a conversion, changing or mutation, as whose *terminus* is substance, (ἡ μεταβολὴ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος ἁπλῶς εἰς οὐσίαν, says *Aristotle*, γένεσις ἁπλῶς) it is properly and simply generation. So fortunate are the Arts and Sciences when they engage for Gods Church against Errour and Falshood.

Physic. lib. 5.

But the best jest is yet behind, All the stir and bluster he makes and crowing over me is, because I say, The Body of Christ is made of the Wafer, which is the very language of the School-men and the Fathers. For besides that *conficere corpus Christi* is an usual phrase with them. St. *Ambrose* plainly

says

says, *Ubi accessit consecratio de pane fit Christi caro.* And again, *Sermo Christi creaturam mutat & sic ex pane fit Corpus Christi. The Body or flesh of Christ is made of the Bread.* Which *ex pane*, according to my Adversaries own sense, designs the material Cause. And St. *Austin*, *Corpus Christi & sanguis virtute Spiritûs sancti ex panis vinique substantia efficitur. The Body and Blood of Christ is made of the substance of the Bread and Wine.* No words can signifie the material Cause more fully then these expressions. So that now my Antagonist may clap his wings and crow over St. *Austin*, and St. *Ambrose* for their learned Non-sense, as well as over me. Thus unfortunate is humour, wit, and eloquence, when it will ingage against true Religion, sound Philosophy, and right Reason. But he knows this was but a farce to the people, and does ingenuously at last acknowledge he has said nothing as yet in Answer to my Argument, in that he says he does but now come to it.

His Answer to the Argument from that *Logical* and *Metaphysical* Principle, *Nothing can be and not be at the same time*, in this sixth Paragraph.

I come now to his Argument, saith he; Transubstantiation implies that the same thing is and is not at the same time. This, says he, I deny. First, because Physicks have rendred it probable that a thing which actually is may be reproduced without losing its actual existence. And if we should say that Christs Body is thus reproduced in the Sacrament, it will not follow that the Body of Christ is, and is not at once, viz. *before the consecration;*

Consecration; But onely that it is by a first production, and is not by a second production till after the Consecration.

Secondly, That when the Host is converted into the Body of Christ, there is no necessity of the granting of the production of a new Body which was not before, but onely that the Body begins to be where it was not before. As in the augmentation of our Bodies there is no need of a new Soul, but the same Soul occupies those parts of matter that have accrewed to the Body in its augmentation. The first is verbatim out of him. The second Answer contains the full strength of his own words.

The Reply.

To the first Answer I Reply, That it has no basis, For *Physicks* exhibit no such probability, nor has he nor can he produce the least Instance thereof. But in the mean time it is worth the taking notice of in this Answer, how well assured in his own mind, for all his external cavilling before, my Adversary is, That the meaning of that Proposition of mine, That that individual thing that can be and is to be made of any thing, is not, was intended by me of such things as which once made are not to be destroyed: or in such a sense as this, That that individual thing that can be made or is to be made of any thing, in that point of time that it is to be made, is not. Which is an Axiome *noematically* true. And therefore to say that a Body is by a first production, but yet still remaining produced

produced is to be again produced entirely, even while it remains produced, that is to ſay, that it remains produced already in that very point of time that it is to be produced, is plainly to confeſs that the very ſame individual thing is produced and not produced, or unproduced at the ſame time. For the *terminus productionis* is one and the ſame individual body A. Now according to *Ariſtotle* and the common ſenſe of all men, all production whether Accidental or Eſſential has its contrary termes and proceeds *à Privatione ad Actum*, from Privation to Act. So that let A be Accident or Eſſence, A muſt be ſuppoſed not to be that it may become A, or be made A; ſuppoſing A ſuch an Individual Body, when it is to be produced the *Termini Productionis* are non-A and A. That which is to be made A, from not being A it becomes A. Otherwiſe it being the ſame Individual Body and being before, it could not of not being this Individual Body become this Individual Body A, but onely A would be in a new place. Which is no Eſſential production as is here ſuppoſed, but onely local mutation; and conſequently the Individual Body A is not produced, when it is thus ſuppoſed reproduced. And therefore if it be really reproduced, as is pretended, it is a demonſtration that it then was not. Wherefore it being certain that our Saviours Body does not ceaſe to be; if Tranſubſtantiation be true that pretends it reproduced, it neceſſarily implies that it then is not. And therefore it plainly is and is not, according to that doctrine, at the ſame time. Beſides, if it were poſſible that A, ſuppoſe *Socrates*, could

could be produced while *Socrates* is in being, it can be no otherwise then thus, that is to say, That another man exquisitely *Socrates*, to whom *Socrateity* is fully and essentially communicated in all points, is also produced. But then this will also follow, that *Socrates* is now become a *Genus*, and this and that *Socrates* are the *species infimæ* of it, which we usually call *Individuals*, and so they will not be *idem numero* but *diversa numero* and consequently not the same Persons. And so the same Individual *Socrates* or the same Individual A will be produced and not produced at the same breath. For things that differ *numerically* cannot be the same Individuals. So impossible every way is this first Fiction, and implies still the same Repugnancy. For if in the second production, the individual Body of Christ be produced, it necessarily argues that Body before not to be his individual Body, so that his Body then was not, according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which yet certainly was, and therefore if that doctrine be true, it is again true, That the Body of Christ is and is not at the same time.

To the second Answer I Reply, First, That it is apparently repugnant to the very Definition of Transubstantiation by the Council of Trent. Which saith, That there is a conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ. Which, say they, is fitly and properly called Transubstantiation. But if there were no production of the Body of Christ, but onely the causing of it to be where it was not before, this

this would not be properly Tranſubſtantiation, but *mutatio Localis*. But in the action of Tranſubſtantiation the *terminus* is *ſubſtantia* not *Locus*, it being the tranſubſtantiating one ſubſtance into another.

Secondly, If the Body of Chriſt be not produced, but there be onely *mutatio Localis*; the ſubſtance of the Bread either remains or is annihilated. That the Bread remains is expreſly againſt the doctrine of the Roman Church. That it is annihilated, is to give the power of Annihilation to a creature which is onely proper to God, and to ſupoſe that every conſecration of the Hoſt annihilates ſo much of the matter of the Univerſe; which muſt needs ſeem very harſh and abſurd to any unprejudiced Judgement. Beſides that there is this palpable repugnancy in it, That whereas Tranſubſtantiation is ſaid to be the converſion of all the ſubſtance of the Bread into Chriſts Body, this plainly implies that there is the converſion of none at all into it, it being all annihilated and exterminated out of the Univerſe. To ſay nothing of the *Accidents* of the Bread remaining after this Annihilation, it being unconceivable where they ſhould be ſubjected, or that any modes of ſubſtance ſhould be ſeparated from their ſubſtance, and exiſt without it. And then to what end it ſhould be that the ſpecies of the Bread ſhould appear by the Divine Omnipotency, the ſubſtance of Bread being annihilated. When it would conduce far more to our belief of the corporeal Preſence of Chriſt, in lieu of the annihilated Bread, if thoſe ſpecies did not appear, or were ſo changed that they

they seemed much above the nature of ordinary Bread. Which things being not, it is a plain Judication to the unprejudiced, that the Bread is still Bread after the Consecration. Else God would be found exercising his Omnipotency, in exhibiting such perfect species of Bread and Wine in such a way as is most effectual to drive all Christians to the misbelief of the pretended Mystery of Transubstantiation: Which were a grand absurdity and incompetible to the Divine Wisdom and Goodness, if that Mystery were true.

And thirdly and lastly, for his quaint allusion to the Soul, which being the same yet extends it self into new parts of matter accrewing to the Body in its augmentation; it is a pretty offer of wit, but in my apprehension it extremely falls short of the present Case. For the Soul being still one and the same Spirit undistanced from it self and uninterrupted can contract and extend it self within moderate bounds. But to imagine Christs Body in Heaven by extending it self from thence to the Earth upon every consecration of the Host, continuedly, so to become present where it was not, is to make him even perpetually in a manner to have a monstrously big and mishapen Body, stretched out into parts God knows how many Thousand miles long, which any judicious minde and of a quick sense cannot but hugely abhor from thinking on. But this being not, He must either come down from Heaven upon the Consecration and Annihilation of the Bread, leaving Heaven quite for the time, and ever and anon travail on Earth,

Earth, and ſo ſwiftly as to be in many places at once, and ſome many Thouſand miles diſtant one from another, which how abſurd it is has been often intimated; which alſo ſeems to claſh with, *Acts* 3. 21. Or elſe as it were taking leave of himſelf in Heaven and parting from himſelf and yet leaving himſelf behind he comes down to ſupply the room of the annihilated Bread. Or laſtly, he is preſent in the room of the ſaid Bread, without at all paſſing from Heaven to Earth. Both which ſeem altogether impoſſible and unconceivable, For how can one and the ſame Body go from a place and yet leave it ſelf entirely behind in the ſaid place, and ſo as it were divide it ſelf entirely from it ſelf? Or how is it poſſible it ſhould be found in two diſtant places, without paſſing at leaſt as great a ſpace as that which lyes directly betwixt? Theſe things are clearly and perfectly impoſſible. And if they were not, yet are they quite beſide the cuſhion, this Anſwer balking the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation eſtabliſhed by the Council of Trent.

So plain is it every way, That neither this nor his former Anſwer enervates any thing the force of my Argument which proves that Tranſubſtantiation implies that the ſame thing is and is not at once. And therefore this Argument together with all the former againſt Tranſubſtantiation, notwithſtanding all the Aſſaults of my Adverſary, remaining ſo manifeſtly ſtrong and invincible, let the impartial Reader judge whether I have cryed *Victory before my time* or behaved my ſelf any way *in down-*

down-bearing words Hector-like, as he ſays, and not rather like a true *Trojan,* or to ſpeak more properly in ſo weighty a Cauſe, like a ſincere Chriſtian, ſpeaking the Truth from my very heart, as I find it in the innate and indeleble characters writ by Gods own finger in the underſtandings of all Men that will open their eyes to Read them, even thoſe indubitable firſt principles of *Phyſicks,* *Metaphyſicks,* *Mathematicks,* and *Logick,* and the *common ſenſe* of all mankind, learned and unlearned. So far am I from thoſe Arts and ſleights of Men, who managing a wrong Cauſe do ſwagger and vapour to ſet off a falſhood. Truth needs no ſuch ill Artifices of wit; My Adverſary indeed ſwaggers much here in bearing us in hand that the difficulties of the Trinity are equal or greater then theſe of Tranſubſtantiation, and ſo harpes again on the ſame ſtring, but to this I have ſufficiently Anſwered above, and yet it may be I may touch upon it again in the cloſe of my next Reply.

His Anſwer to the eighth Paragraph touching *Coſterus* the Jeſuite.

My Antagoniſt does altogether decline ſaying any thing to my ſeventh Paragraph, which I deſire my Reader conſiderately to peruſe, and obſerve the great judgement and diſcretion of my Opponent in ſo doing. But to that about Coſterus *in this eighth Paragraph he Anſwers thus. Here is, ſaith he, the ground of* Coſterus *his conceſſion, That if the true Body of Chriſt be not in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt,*

Euchariſt, the Church of Rome *in that point is in ſuch errour and Idolatry as never was ſeen or heard of. Namely, becauſe Chriſt then had dealt unworthily with his Church, in leaving them to fall into ſuch Idolatry by occaſion of his own words, and by conſequence would not be the true Chriſt; And therefore the adoration of the Euchariſt would be not onely a miſtake as to the Circumſtance but alſo as to the Object, there being no ſuch adorable Object in the world as a true Chriſt according to this ſuppoſition, and ſo the* Cultus Latriæ *would be exhibited to a meer Creature. And adds, That if Tranſubſtantiation can be proved a meer Figment he will willingly grant as much as* Coſterus *to the full. This is the main of his Anſwer and the full ſtrength thereof.*

The Reply.

This is an adventurous Anſwer indeed which hazards the Divinity of Chriſt, nay the making him an Impoſtor and all the Churches of Chriſtendom ſingle Idolaters at leaſt, and themſelves double Idolaters, who then Worſhip not onely a meer Man, but the ſymbolical preſence of a meer Man, which is double Idolatry by Concluſion 19th. Chap. 2. but this is a cunning though a very evil fetch of my Adverſary meerly to elude the Teſtimony of *Coſterus*, *viz* That the Divinity of Chriſt ſtanding, and he ſtill acknowledged the true Chriſt, yet the Adoration of the Euchariſt is Idolatry, unleſs Tranſubſtantiation be true. Which moſt cer-

tainly is the sense of *Costerus* in that place, Chap. 12. N. 10. nor did he dream of any such consequence as my Adversary pins upon him; as if he meant that then Christ would not be the true Christ if Transubstantiation were not true, and that thence the Idolatry would proceed. But I will set the whole argumentation of *Costerus* before my Readers eyes, and let him judge, whether his Argument be such as my Adversary pretends. *If in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the true Body of Christ be not contained, Christ dealt unworthily with his Church, whom throughout the world for 1500 years together, he has by occasion of his own words left in such errour and Idolatry as was never in the whole world seen or heard of.* And then follows that which I have cited in this eighth Paragraph. *For the errours of those, &c.* which makes up the whole Argument.

Where I Observe, First, that there is not the least men ion or intimation, That Christ would not be Christ if his words, *This is my Body*, did not signifie properly but figuratively, but rather firmely supposing him to be Christ, he would not do any thing so unworthy of his own Office and Dignity, as to use words in such a way as should occasion the Church to plunge into so foul Idolatry for so long a time; acknowledging that it would be Idolatry though he were the true Christ, but that he being so would not use such words but in their proper sense, that he might not occasion that Idolatry. I say in the first place, there is no such thing in this place of *Costerus* as my Antagonist puts upon him. And then secondly I affirm, That no man

man in his wits could be ſo devoid of either Reaſon or Piety, as to ſay, in good earneſt, That if theſe words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*, be to be underſtood figuratively, and not literally or properly, Chriſt is an Impoſtor, that is, is not the true Chriſt, which is expreſly the ſenſe which my Antagoniſt would pin upon this paſſage of *Coſterus*. For firſt it is well known that it is uſual in the Hebrew *idiome*, in which Chriſt ſpake, as it is not unfrequent alſo in other tongues, to uſe the verb ſubſtantive [*eſt*] when the *ſubject* and *predicate* in a propoſition is *ſignum* and *ſignificatum*, or if you will when the *ſubject* and *predicate* are thoſe Arguments which *Logicians* call *Similia*. So our Saviour ſays elſewhere, *I am the Vine*, *I am the door*. And St. *Paul* ſays, 1 Cor. 10. 4 *The rock was Chriſt*; beſides the examples I have produced in the foregoing Paragraph. Will any Body therefore that has the leaſt dram of Reaſon or Religion in him, when, (*This is my Body*) may ſo naturally, and according to the *idiome* of the tongue ſignifie, This is the ſign or ſymbol of my Body, or this is the Repreſentation of my Body, that is to be broken or crucified for you, affirm, that unleſs it ſignifie, This is my very Body indeed, fleſh, blood, and bones, Chriſt muſt be an Impoſtor? Nay when Chriſt himſelf ſo plainly affirms, (*Matth.* 26. 26.) that it is Bread For he affirms of that Bread which he had uſed no conſecration to, that even that was his Body.

Indeed if he had firſt done ſomething to it for the tranſmutation of it, and then taken it up and

ſaid, *This is my Body*, here had been more colour of pretence, that it was not ordinary Bread. But he ſays of this Bread as yet unconſecrated, *That it is his Body*, and therefore he plainly affirms, that Bread remaining ſtill really Bread is his Body, which can be in no ſenſe ſo but in a figurative one, that is to ſay, That it is the ſign or ſymbol of his Body; Wherefore when our Saviour does ſo plainly affirm, that the Bread is but the ſymbol of his Body, is it any fault in him, that the Church of *Rome* or any lapſed Church elſe will ſo perverſly and abſurdly underſtand it, as if it were the very Body of Chriſt it ſelf upon Conſecration? as if our Saviour Chriſt had declared it ſo to be?

And beſides this affirmation of our Saviour we may add the Atteſtation of his Evangeliſts, whom he lead into all Truth. Does not St. *Luke* expreſly ſay, *chap.* 22. 19. *He took Bread and gave thanks and brake and gave it to them ſaying, This is my Body which was given for you, do this in remembrance of me.* What can poſſibly be more plain then this? He gave what he brake, he brake what he took, and what he took was Bread, and of this Bread which he gave, brake and took, he ſays, *This is my Body*; Wherefore it is evident that of the Bread he pronounced, according to the Teſtimony of St. *Luke*, *That it was his Body.* But Bread cannot be his Body otherwiſe then ſymbolically, or by way of token or remembrance, and therefore he adds, *Do this in remembrance of me.* Now memory is not of things preſent but of things abſent. All which circumſtances do ſo emphatically import, that

that the Bread is but ſtill a ſign not the Body of Chriſt himſelf, that the moſt cautious Lawyer could ſcarce expreſs any ones mind in a conveyance more certainly and expreſly. And yet our Saviour muſt be an Impoſtor if he did not mean by *This is my Body*, This is my real Body, the ſame that hung upon the Croſs, and was born of the Virgin *Mary*. Can there be any thing more injurious to Chriſt and Chriſtian Religion then this?

Add unto all this, That beſides that Chriſt himſelf and the Evangeliſts declare that it is Bread and not the natural Body of Chriſt, it is demonſtratively impoſſible to be ſo, and openly repugnant to all our ſenſes, which alone would aſſoile our Saviour from being an Impoſtor, the words being eaſily to be underſtood in a figurative ſenſe.

But I hope by this, my Adverſary bluſhes that he has pinned ſo uncouth and incredible a ſenſe on this Argument of *Coſterus*, and will acknowledge that *Coſterus* uſed this Argument onely as a probability; namely, That Chriſt being ſo certainly the true Chriſt, it is not probable that he would deal ſo unworthily with his Church as by theſe words, *This is my Body*, occaſion ſo great Idolatry in this *Artolatria*, or Bread-worſhip continued ſo long in it, and that therefore it is not Bread, but the real Body of Chriſt; which yet is as well argued or rather far worſe, then if the *Anthropomorphites* of old ſhould have argued thus: That certainly God would not have dealt ſo unworthily with his Church, as to occaſion ſo hideous an errour and blaſphemy, that the eternal God has limbes and ſhape like a Man,

from theſe words, *Let us make man after our own Image,* if ſo be he have not ſo. And that therefore he has the lineaments and ſhape of a Man.

But beſides this, where there is *no pretenſe from Scripture* to any ſuch thing, it is plain that the Church for as long a time have defiled themſelves with the Invocation of Saints and worſhipping of Images, which are groſs Idolatries as well as this; nay indeed when the *Scripture is expreſly againſt it.* Which yet, if you will believe the Romaniſts themſelves, have poſſeſſed the Church as many hundred years as this worſhipping of the Euchariſt, though they be all really Innovations upon the lapſe of the Church, as the skilfull in Antiquity do abundantly prove. And for this groſs errour of Tranſubſtantiation, it was not confirmed by any Council till about 1200 after Chriſt.

Wherefore what an intolerable injury and calumny is it againſt the ſacred Perſon of Chriſt, to caſt this Bread-worſhip upon him, as if by the occaſion of his words it was introduced, when indeed both againſt his words and againſt all ſenſe and Reaſon the lapſe and corruption of the Church has brought it in with other Idolatrous opinions and miſpractiſes. But when all this is ſo, to ſay Chriſt is not Chriſt, that is, That Chriſt is an Impoſtor, if theſe words, *This is my Body*, be not literally to be underſtood, as if it were his very true natural Body, fleſh, blood, and bones, I leave to any one to judge, if it be not ſo groundleſs and ſo hideous a reproach, that it will be hard to find any name ill enough for it.

And

And here I profeſs, I cannot but ſtand infinitely aſtoniſh'd at the bold Rhetorick of my Adverſary, and ſuch like Patrons of the Roman Cauſe: who for the ſwaggering of the credulous people into a belief of Tranſubſtantiation, do not ſtick to own it as reaſonable and certain as that *Jeſus* is the *Meſſias*, or that the Myſtery of the holy Trinity is true. Whenas the Myſtery of the holy Trinity has been no leſs then three or four times confirmed by general Councils in the more pure Times of the Church, before her grand Apoſtaſy, and Chriſt always held the true Meſſias, nor can it be doubted but he is ſo by any that is a Chriſtian; and may be demonſtrated to be ſo to any that do doubt, if they approve themſelves but idoneous Auditors. Nor can there be any Reaſon or demonſtration brought againſt the Myſtery of the holy Trinity, ſo far forth as the Scripture and the ancient Councils have defined any thing therein; But the Triunity of the eternal Deity has ſeemed to the beſt and wiſeſt Philoſophers ſo reaſonable and venerable a Tradition, that without any force or fear of any external Power, they have embraced it of themſelves and ſpoken many things therein very conſonant to the Chriſtian verity. And therefore this Myſtery, though it be competently obſcure, whereby it becomes more venerable, to ſay it is as repugnant and as impoſſible to Reaſon as Tranſubſtantiation, whenas it was Confirmed by ſo many general Councils in the purer times of the Church, and intimated by ſo many places of Scripture, as alſo is the Divinity of Chriſt moſt expreſly and indubitably, and his

Messias-ship not questioned by any Christian; to set these Fundamentals of our Religion on the same tickle point, nay on the same impossible point that Transubstantiation stands upon, not countenanced by any Council, till about four or five hundreds years ago, and repugnant to Scripture and Common sense, and to the very first Principles of all solid knowledge and science, were it not charitably to be interpreted a ranting piece of Rhetorick to befool the vulgar; as if they would say, As sure as Christ is the Messias and that the Mystery of his Divinity and of the Triunity of the Godhead is true, Transubstantiation is so; it were either a careless disregard what became of Christianity, or a subdolous and operose endeavour of betraying it, and oblique insinuation, that Transubstantiation and the rest of those Mysteries of our Religion are alike false and impossible. But I hope better things of my Adversary, and that he is rather an over officious propugner of a beloved falshood, and of so great interest to his Church, then a sly Impugner or Betrayer of these sacred Truths.

And now, I hope, I have fully cleared all the Objections that my Antagonist has brought against this third Chapter, or any Paragraph therein: So that it remains invincible and unshaken, That the Opinion of Transubstantiation is not onely false but impossible, and consequently the Adoration of the Eucharist palpable Idolatry. Which my Adversary himself cannot deny, no more than *Franciscus Costerus* who has so expresly affirmed it, as I have shewed in this eighth Paragraph.

As

As for that further offer towards a plauſibility for the Truth of Tranſubſtantiation, (for the Myſtery of the holy Trinity wants no ſuch ſmall apologies) that the ſeeming Impoſſibility thereof, is an Argument of its being a doctrine Divinely inſpired, and that that ſaying rightly here takes place, *The more incredible the more credible*: Theſe are fine Lullaby-ſongs to be ſung to babies half aſleep; But we have moſt evidently demonſtrated, even as clear as Noonday, that Tranſubſtantiation is not a *ſeeming* Impoſſibility but a *palpable* and *real* one. And as for that ſaying, *The more incredible the more credible*, it is a foundation ſo *large*, that all the Figments, even the moſt extravagant of all the Religions of the World may equally be founded upon it, and by how much more incredible and impoſſible any Figment, is by ſo much the more ſtronger faith it ought to obtain, and may the more firmly be ſupported by this Foundation. For the more impoſſible the more incredible, the more incredible the more credible. As for example, the more incredible it is that *Mahomet* put the Moon into his boſome, and that it came out at each ſleeve divided into two, and that he ſtraitways ſodered it together, and ſent it back whole to Heaven again, the more incredible this ſtory is, the more credible it is. That is, ſaith my Antagoniſt, (for he explains this venerable Aphoriſm) By how much the more incredible the Myſtery is; if we onely conſult our ſenſes and the bare ſentiments of the natural Man, by ſo much the more

more credible it is that there lyes a Divine Revelation at the bottom. Cannot the *Mahumetan* defend his Religion as wisely as thus from this ground?

It is not a sign of our meer natural or unregenerate estate when we will not nor can believe things that are apparently repugnant to the indeleble Principles of natural Understanding. But it is a sign of their being the slaves of the Man of sin in a double sense, who can swallow such gudgeons. For for this cause God sends them strong delusions, saith the Apostle, (*2 Thes.* 2.) that they may believe a lye, because they love not the Truth but have pleasure in unrighteousness. But (*John* 8.36.) *if the Son makes us free* by his spirit of real Regeneration, *then are we free indeed*, even from all such Impostures as these, while the world (*Apoc.* 17.8.) *wonders after the Beast*, and the strange stories that he utters. But we know who those are that are excluded out of the holy City, even every one that (*Apoc.* 22.15.) *loves and makes a lye*, and those certainly are none of the Regenerate. And who should those be that love and embrace lyes, but those that take up such Principles that they cannot discern a lye or withhold their assent from it? For the more Impossible, which should turn any Mans stomach from believing, makes it but the more Incredible, and the more Incredible the more Credible.

But we have harped too long on a string which will sound over harsh to such ears as are less accustomed to Truth. My main purpose I had dis-

patch'd

patch'd before, But I could not but say something to the fine popular fetches of my Adversarie, who cunningly insinuates into the minds of the unskilfull and simple, that it is a sign of a more then ordinary Religious and regenerate estate, far removed above the meer natural Man, to believe things that are plainly and apertly repugnant to the light of Nature and right Reason. For this is such a gap as may let in the grossest falsities and Immoralities that can be invented, and that upon the shew of Religion and Supernaturality. For giving up their faith to their Priest and his Church, the more incredible the Act to be good or Doctrine true, the more credible. What therefore may not Men be brought to believe and act upon so unsound a Principle? I pass now to his fourth Section, which encounters all my three next Chapters at once.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The groſs Idolatry of the Romaniſts *in the Invocation of the Saints even according to the allowance of the Council of* Trent, *and the authorized practice of that Church.*

1. BUT we will fall alſo upon thoſe Modes of Idolatry wherein the Church of *Rome* may ſeem leſs bold; though indeed this one, that is ſo groſs, is ſo often and ſo univerſally repeated every-where in the *Roman* Church, that by this alone, though we ſhould take notice of nothing farther, Idolatry may ſeem quite to have overſpread her like a noiſom Leproſy. But, how-ever, we ſhall proceed; and firſt to their *Invocation of Saints*. Touching which the Council of *Trent* declares this Doctrine expreſly: *Sanctos utique unà cum* Chriſto *regnantes Orationes ſuas pro hominibus offerre, bonúmque atque utile eſſe ſuppliciter eos invocare; & ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per Filium ejus* Jeſum Chriſtum, *ad eorum orationes, operam auxiliumque confugere.* Where Invocation of Saints is plainly allow'd and recommended: and beſides their praying for us, or offering up our Prayers to God, it is plainly imply'd that there are other Aids and Succours they can afford, if they be ſupplicated, that is, invoked with moſt humble and proſtrate Devotion. And the pretending that this is all but the way of procuring thoſe good things we want from God, the firſt Fountain, and that through his Son *Chriſt*; that makes the Saints the more exactly like the Pagans *Dii medioxumi*, and the *Dæmons* that negotiated the affairs of men with the higheſt Deity.

Concil. Trident. *Seſſ.* 9.

2. I

2. I ſay then that, though they went no farther then thus, even this is down-right Idolatry which the Council of *Trent* thus openly owns, (and conſequently the whole Church of *Rome*,) as appears from the third, fourth, fifth, ſixth and eighth Concluſions of the firſt Chapter; as alſo by the fifth, ſeventh, eighth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and twenty-fourth of the ſecond. But if we examine thoſe Prayers that are put up to the Saints, their Invocation is ſtill the more unexcuſable.

3. Wherefore looking to the publick Practiſe of the Church of *Rome*, authoriſed by the Popes themſelves, the Invocation of a Saint does not conſiſt in a meer *Ora pro nobis*, as people are too forward to phanſy that the ſtate of the Queſtion, (though the meer invoking of them to pray for us would be Idolatry, as is already proved:) but, which is inſinuated in the Council it ſelf, there are other more particular Aids and Succours that they implore of them, and ſome ſuch as it is proper for none but God or *Chriſt* to give: Such as Protection from the Devil, Divine Graces, and the Joys of Paradiſe. But as the things they ask of the Saints are too big for them to be the Diſpoſers of; ſo the Compellations, of the Virgin *Mary* eſpecially, are above the nature of any Creature. Whence this Invocation of Saints will appear a moſt groſs and palpable Mode of Idolatry in that Church. As I ſhall make manifeſt out of the following Examples, taken out of ſuch pieces of Devotion as are not mutter'd in the corners of their Cloſets, but are publickly read or ſung with *Stentorian* Voices in their very Churches. I will onely give the Reader a taſte of this kind of their Idolatry; for it were infinite to produce all we might.

4. And firſt, to begin with the ſmaller Saints, (as indeed they are all to be reckoned in compariſon of the bleſſed Virgin, to whom therefore they give that Worſhip

Worſhip which they call *Hyperdulia*, as they give *Dulia* to the reſt of the Saints, and *Latria* to God alone, and to *Chriſt* as being God:) That Prayer to S. *Coſmas* and S. *Damian* is plainly a Petition to them to keep us from all Diſeaſes, as well of Soul as of Body, that we may attain to the life of the Spirit, and live in Grace here, and be made partakers of Heaven hereafter.

O Medici piiſſimi,
Qui Meritis clariſſimi
In Cœlis refulgetis,
A peſte, clade corporum
Præſervetis, & operum,
Moribus nè languetamus:
Nec moriamur ſpiritu,
Sed Animæ ab obitu
Velociter ſurgamus;
Et vivamus in Gratia,
Sacra Cœli palatia
Donec regrediamur.

5. Such a piece of Devotion as this is that to S. *Francis*: *Sancte* Franciſce, *properè veni*; *Pater, accelera ad populum, qui premitur & teritur ſub onere, palea, luto, latere, & ſepultos* Ægyptio *ſub ſabulo nos libera, carnis extincto vitio.* Which is plainly a Prayer to this Saint that he would deliver us from the bondage and drudgery of Sin, which is onely in the power of our great Saviour and Redeemer *Chriſt* for to do.

That Invocation of S. *Andrew* is alſo for that ſpiritual Grace of duly Bearing the Croſs here, that we may obtain Heaven afterwards.

Jam nos foveto languidos,
Curámque noſtrî ſuſcipe,

Quo

Quò per Crucis victoriam
Cœli petamus gratiam.

But that to S. *Nicolas* is againſt the Aſſaults of the Devil:

Ergò piè nos exaudi
Aſſiſtentes tuæ laudi,
Nè ſubdamur Hoſtis fraudi,
Nobis fer auxilia.
Nos ab omni malo ducas,
Vitâ rectâ nos conducas,
Poſt hanc vitam nos inducas
Ad æterna gaudia.

The like Devotion is done to S. *Martin*, S. *Andrew*, S. *James*, S. *Bartholomew*, and others, though not in the ſame words.

6. When I have given an example or two of their Prayers put up to their She-Saints, I ſhall a little more copiouſly inſiſt on thoſe to the bleſſed Virgin. They beg of S. *Agnes* the greateſt Grace that God is able to impart to the Soul of man, that is to ſay, to ſerve God in perfect Love. And this Gift this one poor ſingle She-Saint is ſolicited to beſtow on all men.

Ave, Agnes *glorioſa*
Me in fide ſerves rectâ,
Dulcis Virgo & dilectâ,
Te exoro precibus:
Charitate da perfectâ
Deum, per quem es electâ,
Colere piè omnibus.

That Devotion put up to S. *Brigitt* is, that ſhe would play the skilfull Pilot, and lead us through all the tempeſts and hazzards of this World ſo ſafely, that at laſt, by

by her good Conduct, we may attain to everlasting Life. The Rhyme runs thus:

O Bregitta, *mater bona,*
Dulcis Ductrix & Matrona,
Nobis fer suffragia;
Naufragantes in hoc Mari
Tuo ductu salutari
Duc ad vitæ bravia.

7. But that to S. *Catharine* is a piece of Devotion something of an higher strain, or rather more copious and expres: But so great a Boon they beg of her as is in the power of none to give but God alone.

Ave, Virgo Dei digna,
Christo *prece me consigna,*
Audi Preces, præsta Votum;
Cor in bono fac immotum.
Confer mihi Cor contritum;
Rege Visum & Auditum:
Rege Gustum & Olfactum,
Virgo sancta, rege Tactum.
Ut in cunctis te regente,
Vivam Deo purâ mente.
Christum *pro me interpella,*
Salva Mortis de procella.
Superare fac me Mundum,
Nè demergar in profundum.
Nè me sinas naufragari
Per Peccata in hoc Mari.
Visita tu me infirmum,
Et in bonis fac me firmum.
Agonista Dei fortis,
Præsto sis in hora mortis.

Decum-

Decumbentem fove, leva,
Et de morte ſolve ſæva;
Ut reſurgam novus homo
Civis in cœleſti domo.

8. Now it is obſervable in this devotional Rhyme to S. *Catharine*, that whereas the Council of *Trent* adviſes men, *ad ſanctorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere*, that in theſe many Verſes there are not paſſing two or three that are an entreating of the Saint to pray for us, but to aid and ſuccour us in ſuch a way as the Story of the Saint and the Alluſion to her Name moſt naturally leads the phancy of the Devotioniſt to think ſutable for her: As if ſhe were the giver of Courage, of Patience, and of Purity of mind, and was to comfort and ſupport us in the very Agony of death by her preſence. Which Petition is very frequent to other Saints alſo. So plain a thing is it, that this Invocation of the Saints is not a mere deſiring of them to pray for us.

But here the Devotioniſt commits the whole *Regimen* of both his Soul and Body unto this Saint, to rule all his Faculties and Senſes, and begs ſo high Vertues and Graces, as that none but God can ſupply us with them; as I intimated at firſt. Whence the Invocation upon that very account alſo muſt appear moſt groſly Idolatrous, as *Grotius*, who yet is no ſuch foe to the Papiſts, does expreſly acknowledge and declare.

CHAP. IV.

His Answer to the first and second Paragraphs in this Chapter.

This the Doctor (namely what the Council of Trent has defined in the first Paragraph) termes the making the Saints more exactly like the Pagans Dii Medioxumi, *and the* Dæmons *that negotiated the affairs of men with the higheſt Deity. Now to prove that this kind of invocation of Saints is down right Idolatry, and by conſequence that we are worſhippers of falſe Gods, he conjures up a Spirit, which for its many names and bad qualities may well be termed* Legion, viz. *the third, fourth, fifth, ſixth, and eighth Concluſions of the firſt Chapter. As alſo, the fifth, ſeventh, eighth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and twenty fourth Concluſions of the ſecond Chapter. But I hope my Anſwer to theſe Concluſions, in the firſt and ſecond Section of this Diſcourſe, will prove Exorciſme enough to lay this foul unclean Spirit of Calumny, and ſilence its Impertinencies.*

The Reply.

THis Anſwer would recommend it ſelf from a ſcheme of confidence and unexpected piece of Drollery; he phancying, as it ſeems, every number writ in words at length, of the fifteen Concluſions

Concluſions I refer to in my ſecond Paragraph, ſo many figures caſt to conjure up a Legion of Devils. But he muſt remember that there are Legions of good Angels alſo, and that ſuch were thoſe that *Michael* was General over when he fought againſt the red Dragon. And theſe Concluſions of mine do fight againſt the red Dragon revived, that Idolatry too too Paganical (though gilded over with the fair pretenſe of Chriſtianity) that is ſo viſible in the Church of *Rome*. So that if theſe Concluſions be a Legion, they are a Legion under *Michael* and therefore good Angels, and victorious as his were notwithſtanding the boaſt of my Adverſary. For I have moſt clearly proved above, that he has produced nothing to enervate them. And therefore theſe Concluſions remaining firm, even according to my Adverſaries own Conceſſion that which I declare in this ſecond Paragraph is firm alſo, *viz.* That what the Council of Trent doth openly own in my firſt Paragraph is down right Idolatry. For my Adverſary has no way to avoid it but by recourſe to his Confuations of the above ſaid Concluſions. Which I have apparently demonſtrated already to be no Confutations at all, in my Replies to them, which is needleſs here to repeat. And therefore I go on to his further Anſwers to theſe three Chapters, which are all of them in a manner in general: As firſt,

His firſt general Anſwer touching the fourth, fifth, and ſixth Chapters of my Antidote.

In the reſt of his fourth and two enſuing Chapters, ſaith he, the Doctor acts a new Perſon. For laying aſide his former Concluſions and Demonſtrations, he trades now wholly in Quotations, languiſhing or doting about Queſtions and ſtrife of words.

The Reply.

I perceive nothing by my ſelf but that I am the ſame perſon ſtill, but having out of the Concluſions named in the ſecond Paragraph demonſtrated ſuch an Invocation of Saints, as the Council of Trent approves of and requires, to be down right Idolatry, which common people pretend to be no more than an *Ora pro nobis*, which yet is Idolatry too; I go on not languiſhing, but hail and hearty, I thank God, nor doting at all I hope, but rationally deducing from the forms of Invocation uſed in the *Roman* Church, that they naturally and plainly ſignifie more than an *Ora pro nobis*. And it is the force and diſtorſion that my Adverſary and his party ordinarily uſe to excuſe theſe things, that raiſes Queſtions and ſtrife of words; when if they did not uſe this art and force to diſtort the ſenſe of them, there could be no ſtrife at all.

His

His ſecond general Anſwer.

Amongſt theſe Quotations we are to meet with a great dearth of Reaſon: three entire Chapters having much ado to furniſh out matter for one argument, and that a poor one, God knows.

The Reply.

Every form of Invocation is a Reaſon for the Concluſion I aim at, which is to prove from either the manner of compellation, or from the nature of the Objects of the Prayers made to the Saints, that the Invocation is Idolatry, and a craſs kind of one too. How then is the Argument but one? and how a poor one? This is plainly intimated in the third Paragraph of this fourth Chapter.

His third general Anſwer.

My buſineſs is, ſaith he, to lay down and amuſe my Reader with a number of ſet Forms of Invocation of Saints, ſcarce ever mentioning the Churches Publick Prayers and Liturgies, Litany, Canonical hours, Pontifical or Ritual, but the Roſary of our Lady and the Mary *Pſalter.*

The Reply.

I thought it ſufficient in my third Paragraph to ſig-

nifie in general, that the examples I give are taken out of ſuch pieces of Devotion as are not muttered in the corners of their Cloſets, but are publickly Read or Sung with *Stentorian* voices in their very Churches. I ſuppoſe my Antagoniſt does not expect I ſhould ſet down in what Churches they are Sung, but to what Saints, which may be done in ſeveral Churches.

His fourth general Anſwer.

As to the Fidelity of his Quotations, ſaith he, I can neither accuſe nor acquit him. But I ſhall allow him all the fair play in the world by ſuppoſing his Allegations to be true, and freely take them upon truſt: Though his carriage hitherto gives no great Cauſe to ſuſpect him guilty of too much candor in that kind.

The Reply.

To which I briefly Reply, That I have ſet down all things in this book *bonâ fide*, without any deſign of impoſing any way upon any one, writing nothing, but what I am in my own Conſcience perſwaded to be true. Nor can imagine what my Adverſary ſhould mean by ſaying, That his carriage hitherto gives no great Cauſe to ſuſpect him guilty of too much candor in that kind. I would not do any thing of this kind knowingly and wittingly for any thing in the World. How ingenuouſly he deals with me in this, let his own Conſci-

ence

ence tell him; which he ſeems to indeavour to ſatisfie by the Equivocalneſs of the Calumny.

His fifth general Anſwer.

That ſince the new charge of Idolatry from all theſe forms of Invocation of the Virgin Mary *and other Saints is this, That their Suppliants ask of them ſuch things as are onely in the Power of our great Saviour and Redeemer Jeſus Chriſt to grant, let us ſingle out, ſaith he, one of the moſt harſh ſounding forms of Invocation that is to be found in all the three Chapters, ſuppoſe* Domina ſalvum me fac, Bleſſed Lady ſave me, *and if this may admit of an Orthodox ſenſe, and that by clear warrant from Scripture, then I hope the reſt that are not ſo ſeemingly unjuſtifiable as this, may in all reaſon be excuſed from that odious Epithet of Idolatrous. Now, ſays he, it is very poſſible, that he that makes this form of Invocation a piece of his Litany,* Domina ſalvum me fac, Bleſſed Lady ſave me, *may be in no more danger of Idolatry thereby than St.* Paul *was when writing to the* Romans (Rom. 11. 14.) *he uttered theſe words,* If by any means I may provoke to emulation thoſe which are of my fleſh and might ſave ſome of them. *Or when he ſpeaks to the* Corinthians (1 *Cor.* 9. 22.) I am made all things to all men that by any means I may ſave ſome. *And therefore if any well-meaning ſuppliant had prayed to the Apoſtle in this very form of Prayer, Holy Apoſtle ſave me; What Idolatry had it been to petition St.* Paul *for a ſa-*

vour which he profeſſed himſelf both ready and able to grant. For here the Apoſtle clearly ſuppoſeth in himſelf not onely the Will but the Power of ſaving Souls. My Adverſary uſes larger circuits and ambages of wit and Rhetorick, but this is the very ſubſtance of his Argument, and ſuch as wherewith he would elude the force of all my cited formes of their Invocation of Saints. But how well he can effect it we ſhall ſee in the proceſs of the matter.

The Reply.

I Reply therefore, that though my Antagoniſt have uſed a great deal of plauſible wit and ſmooth-mouthed Eloquence, yet what he has ſaid is far from ſolid Truth. For to omit for the preſent that this form of Praying, *Domina ſalvum me fac,* is not the harſheſt paſſage in all my Quotations, yet it is ſo harſh that thoſe ſayings of St. *Paul* to the *Romans* and *Corinthians* will not juſtifie it. For we muſt remember that St. *Paul* elſewhere ſays, 1 *Cor.* 3. 6. *that* Paul *may plant and* Apollos *may water but God gives the increaſe*; whereby he plainly declares it not to be in his power nor in any ones power elſe to ſave a man from eternal death. But that it is in the Power of God alone. And therefore it is evident that in thoſe places he profeſſes onely that he uſed all the means he could or the moſt ſeaſonable he could to ſave them But no *Logick* will ever evince, that therefore he thought it to be or that it was in his power to ſave them he ſpeaks of, but onely to uſe his beſt indeavour in his ſubordinate way of action and leave

leave the ſucceſs to God. And therefore it is raſhly and falſly imputed to the Apoſtle both againſt his own profeſſion and againſt the truth of the thing, namely, *That he clearly ſuppoſes in himſelf not onely the will but the power of ſaving Souls*; Which are the very words of my Antagoniſt.

And I do not queſtion, but if any one had in his time been ſo ſilly or wicked as to have kneeled to St. *Paul* with eyes and hands lifted up to him and ſaid, *Holy Apoſtle ſave me*, he would have rent his garments and proteſted againſt it as an enormous and Idolatrous petition, and have been carryed with a great deal of zeal and indignation againſt ſo ſinfull an Action; As *Jacob* was moved againſt *Rachel*, when ſhe ſaid to him, *Gen.* 30. *give me children or elſe I dye.* To whom the Patriarch replied with much anger, What am I in Gods ſted? intimating what an impious and idolatrous act it was, ſo bluntly and abſolutely to ask that of him which was onely in the Power of God to give. *Lo, children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift that cometh of the Lord*, ſaith the *Pſalmiſt*, *Pſal.* 127. 4. How much more then is it, to be made a child of God and an Inheriter of eternal Salvation. This is in no Mortals power to give and therefore cannot be asked of any Creature without Impiety and Idolatry by Concluſion the 8th. Chapter 2. And therefore, *Holy* Paul *ſave me*, could not but have ſeemed to the Apoſtle a Petition blaſphemous and Idolatrous, nor could he have well born that compellation of *Holy Apoſtle* without ſome reproof like that of our Saviour

to

to him that called him *good Maſter*, Mat. 19.17. *why calleſt thou me good, there is none good but onely God.* But we out of the raſh Idea's of our own corrupt minds phancy ſuch things gratefull or tolerable to the Apoſtle, which would really have proved horrid and intolerable to him.

His ſixth general Anſwer.

But yet as if the Apoſtle had in himſelf the power of ſaving Souls, (they are his own words) and as if this Petition, Holy Apoſtle ſave me, *were a lawfull and blameleſs Petition, he further would improve the ſuppoſition thus, That foraſmuch notwithſtanding as the Apoſtle has not in himſelf the power of ſaving Souls, in the quality of a God, but as inſtrumental to their Salvation by his Prayers and Preaching, it is manifeſt that* Holy Apoſtle ſave me, *can ſignify no more than Holy Apoſtle teach me the way of Salvation, or Holy Apoſtle pray for my Salvation: And yet this form of,* Holy Apoſtle ſave me, *being legitimate, it will follow that, (taking our meaſures from the Apoſtles own words and meaning)* Bleſſed Lady ſave me, *will alſo be a lawfull form of Prayer, it ſignifying no more, than* Bleſſed Lady pray for my Salvation. *And ſo all the forms of Prayer, ſaith he, aſſigned by the Doctor taken in the ſenſe of the Apoſtle will amount to no more than a meer* Ora pro nobis. *And thus with her in the Proverbs,* Prov. 30.20. *he has neatly wiped, as he makes ſhow, his own mouth, and the mouth of his party, and ſays, we have done no wickedneſs.*

The

The Reply.

There are two things aſſerted in this Anſwer, Firſt, that all the forms of Invocation that I have recited in theſe three Chapters amount to no more than a meer *Ora pro nobis*. And then, that this is deducible from ſuch grounds. Now as to the firſt, as I ſhall more particularly confute that Aſſertion, when I ſhall afterwards run through the Paragraphs of theſe Chapters, ſo I ſhall here in general intimate that the Aſſertion is plainly repugnant to the very words of the Council of Trent: Which ſays, That it is good and profitable *ad Sanctorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere*, where beſides their Prayers and Interceſſions, there are other helps and aſſiſtences intimated. And therefore theſe Forms of Invocation I have recited in theſe Chapters, mentioning other help and aſſiſtence, beſides their praying and interceding for their Suppliants, how is it poſſible but according to the indication of the Council they underſtand theſe Helps and Aſſiſtences, as things diſtinct from their meer Interceding or Praying for us.

But now I further ſay, That the grounds here offered of this Aſſertion, will not hold. For firſt I have already proved, that the Apoſtle does not affirm any Power in himſelf of ſaving Souls, there being no ſuch Power in him; nor his words to the *Romans* and *Corinthians* implying any ſuch thing, and himſelf elſewhere profeſſing againſt it. So that he has

has not the power of ſaving of Souls in himſelf, neither in the quality of a God, nor in any ſenſe. For to have the power of ſaving of Souls in himſelf as an *Inſtrument*, is a repugnancy, and plainly implies that he has not the power of ſaving of Souls in himſelf, no more then a chiſſel has of carving in it ſelf, or a pencil of limming, or an Harp or Lute of playing a leſſon. And therefore, *Holy Apoſtle ſave me*, would be as good ſenſe as, Lute or Harp play me a leſſon. Indeed *David* ſays, *Pſalm.* 57. *Awake Lute and Harp.* But then by a ſeaſonable *Epanorthoſis* he ſtraitway adds, *I my ſelf will awake right early*: For if he get not up before them and finger them, they will certainly lye dumb and ſilent. And ſo is the very word whether writ or ſpoken by the Apoſtle or others; ſo are all Prayers put up by any one, if the Spirit does not aſſiſt and God ſay Amen to their Prayers, all is ineffectual, all is as perfect dumbneſs and ſilence as in an Inſtrument hung up againſt the wall. Beſides that the mere Praying to another that a thing may be granted is a plain Argument, that the thing is not in that parties power that ſo devoutly askes it. So that though there be a great deal of fineneſs and ſubtilty in theſe Arguments of my Adverſary, yet we ſee they are plainly intangled and contradict one another. And therefore it is not ſenſe, bluntly and abſolutely to ask that of one that is not in his power to give, but onely to try and intreat it, if he can ſo procure it of another.

It is manifeſt therefore, that *Holy Apoſtle ſave me*, and *Bleſſed Lady ſave me*, are groundleſs and incongruous

congruous forms of ſpeech, and plainly ſignifie that to be asked of a Creature which is not in the power of any to give but God alone. (*John* 6.44. *No man comes to me unleſs my Father draw him,*) and conſequently the implying that to be in the Creature which onely is in the Creatour, are Idolatrous forms of ſpeech by the eighth Concluſion of the ſecond Chapter. And thus we ſee my Adverſary is far from proving by this fetch, That all the forms of Invocation which I have recited amount to no more than an *Ora pro nobis*. Which though it were true, as it is moſt manifeſtly falſe, yet the Reader is to remember, they are down right Idolatry by the ſecond Paragraph of this Chapter. And moſt Paganically ſo while theſe Petitions are put up before the Image, at the Altar, and in the Temple dedicated to this or that Saint. And thus I have fully Replied in the general to the general Anſwers of my Antagoniſt to theſe three Chapters, which are all the Anſwers he has given. I ſhall take occaſion to make ſome more particular Replies to ſome of them as I run through the Paragraphs of theſe Chapters, eſpecially in reference to his laſt general Anſwer and his ſecond, proving plainly, that the ſenſe of theſe Invocations are more than an *ora pro nobis*. And that greater things are asked and greater Compellations uſed then are competible to mere Creatures to give, or be invocated by. In the mean time it is plain, that the reſt of his fourth Section falls of it ſelf by vertue of what has already been ſpoken.

Upon the fourth Paragraph.

In this Prayer to St. *Coſmas* and St. *Damian* it is obſervable how the Devotion is framed with a ſutableneſs to the condition of the Saints when they dwelt on Earth. And therefore *Coſmas* and *Damian* having been of the faculty of Phyſick here, they are made to retain it ſtill, but in an higher degree and to have the power of curing both Body and Soul, as if by their merits they had obtained ſuch a Privilege from God. And that Souls departed are exerciſed about ſuch things as they were taken up with in this life, was alſo the Opinion of the ancient Heathen, as you may ſee in *Virgil*, *Plutarch*, *Maximus Tyrius*, and others. People may find evaſions for any thing, but conſidering the Council of Trent mentions Ayds and Aſſiſtences diſtinct from their Interceſſions, and the ſecond Council of *Nice*, to which the Council of *Trent* attributes ſo much to, produces Inſtances hereof, any one that has but half an eye will eaſily diſcern this meaning I have given to be true. And that the Invocation of theſe Saints is not a meer *Ora pro nobis*, but the craving of them ſuch peculiar ayds and helps as are ſuppoſed proper for them to give; contrary to my Antagoniſts laſt general Anſwer.

Upon the fifth Paragraph.

Which is alſo manifeſt out of the Invocation of

of St. *Francis* in this next Paragraph, *Sancte Franciſce properè veni, &c.* For St. *Francis* being deſired to haſt and come to his people plainly intimates it is not a mere *Ora pro nobis*; (For that he might, one would think, moſt conveniently perform in Heaven before the face of God) but by his Preſence and Aſſiſtence to his Suppliant to deliver him from the ſoul bondage and burden of ſin; *carnis extincto vitio*, he himſelf having been ſuch an eminent example of Mortification here on Earth, and therefore being now endewed with a peculiar Power of helping men to mortifie ſin and to deliver them from that bondage, accordingly as was obſerved in the former Petition. Which is a boon too great for any but Chriſt himſelf to give. So that it is groſs Idolatry on that account alſo. St. *Andrew*'s being crucified on the Croſs is ſuppoſed likewiſe to have intitled him to the right and Power of inabling men to bear the Croſs. But whether St *Nicolas* was famous alſo for incountring the Devil in his life time I know not. What has been ſaid already on this Paragraph is ſufficient to prove that the Invocation of Saints are not a mere *Ora pro nobis.*

Upon the ſixth Paragraph.

That Prayer to St. *Agnes* is both for a boon alone to be given by God, and is plainly directed to her in a form ſo far from an *Ora pro nobis*, that it is, *Te exoro precibus. I pray you to keep me in the right faith*, or, *Grant you that all may ſerve God*

in

in perfect Charity. And ſo the Prayer to St. *Brigite* calls her, *dulcis ductrix*, and ſays, *tuo ductu ſalutari duc ad vitæ bravia.* By your ſafe guidance bring us to the reward of everlaſting life. Which can by no ways be reduced to an *Ora pro nobis*, which may be a further Reply to his ſecond and laſt generall Anſwer.

Upon the ſeventh Paragraph.

Upon this Paragraph or the Hymn to St. *Catharine* in it, I need ſay no more than I have already ſaid in my next Paragraph concerning it, which my Reader may conſiderately read over, and then obſerve with himſelf not onely touching this preſent Invocation but alſo the former, how fully that of the Council of Trent *ad Sanctorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere*, agrees with their forms of Invocation to Saints, which is not onely to pray for them, but to give them further ayds and aſſiſtences according to the proper privileges that they are ſuppoſed by their merits to have obtained, and ſome ſo great, that they belong onely to God, whence the groſneſs of the Idolatry is further argued, and a further Reply made to his ſecond and laſt general Anſwers.

But for the intitling of the Saints to a power of aſſiſting correſpondent to ſome Action, or condition of life of theirs here, I have obſerved in ſeveral other forms of Invocation in their *Hortulus Animæ* printed at *Dilinga*, *cum facultate Superiorum:* As to St. *Thomas*, *O glorious toucher of the wounds*

wounds of our Lord Jesus, do thou vouchsafe to establish us thy Suppliants in the faith of him whom by touching, thou deservedst, to acknowledge to be God. And to St. *Ambrose*, *O most blessed Bishop and greatest Doctor* Ambrose, *who teachest the safe way, guide thou the course of my life, &c.* And to St. *Austin*, *O glorious light of the Church help us to profit in the precepts of God, and in thy Doctrine*, &c. Where it is again observable, they make their direct addresses to these Saints, and upon account of what it is peculiar for them to help them in, and that it is not a mere *Ora pro nobis*, but in the mean time abundantly conformable to the words of the Council of *Trent*.

CHAP. V.

Forms of Invocation of the bleſſed Virgin uſed by the Church of Rome *egregiouſly Idolatrous.*

1. AND if they can contain themſelves no better in their Devotions towards theſe leſſer Saints, to whom their Church-men will allow onely the Worſhip they call *Dulia*, how wilde and extravagant will they ſhew themſelves in their Addreſſes to the Virgin *Mary*, the Mother of God, to whom they allow the Worſhip they call *Hyperdulia*? And that is the thing I will now take notice of, though not according to the copiouſneſs of the Snbject; for it would even fill a Volume. But ſome Inſtances I will produce, and thoſe ſuch as are publick and authentick, as I intimated at firſt. In the *Roſary* of the bleſſed Virgin ſhe is ſaluted thus:

Reparatrix & Salvatrix deſperantis Anima,
Irroratrix & largitrix ſpiritualis Gratiæ,
Quod requiro, quod ſuſpiro, mea ſana Vulnera,
Et da menti te poſcenti Gratiarum munera;
Ut ſim caſtus, & modeſtus, dulcis, fortis, ſobrius,
Vius, rectus, circumſpectus, ſimultatis neſcius,
Eruditus, & munitus Divinis eloquiis,
Conſtans, gravis, & ſuavis, benignus, amabilis,
Corde prudens, ore ſtudens veritatem dicere,
Malum nolens, Deum volens pio ſemper opere.

A very excellent Prayer, if it had been directed to a due Object. But ſuch things are asked as are in the power of none but of *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf, as he is God, to give.

2. For

2. For the Virgin *Mary* is here made no leſs then a Saviour and giver of all ſpiritual Graces; as ſhe is alſo a giver of eternal Life in what follows in Proſe. *Peccatorum conſolatrix, infirmorum curatrix, errantium revocatrix, juſtorum confirmatrix, deſolatorum ſpes & auxiliatrix, atque mea promptiſſima adjutrix, tibi, Domina glorioſa, commendo hodie & quotidie Animam meam; ut me in cuſtodiam tuam commendatum ab omnibus malis & fraudibus Diaboli cuſtodias, atque in hora mortis conſtanter mihi aſſiſtas, ac Animam ad aterna gaudia perducas.* Here is the commending of the Soul of the Devotioniſt into the Protection of the Virgin, that he may be kept from all Evil, and from the Frauds of the Devil, and that ſhe would aſſiſt at the hour of death to convey his Soul to the eternal Joys of Heaven.

3. Like that at the end of the *Roſary*; *Cor meum illumina, fulgens Stella Maris, Et ab hoſtis machina ſemper tuearis. O glorioſa Virgo* Maria, *mater Regis aterni, Libera nos ab omni malo, & à pœnis Inferni.* Which is a Petition for Illumination of heart, for Security from the Devil and from eternal Death: which is onely the Privilege of the Son of God, the eternal Wiſdom of the Father, to grant, who is ſaid alſo (*Apoc.* 1. 18.) to *have the Keys of Hell and of Death.*

4. But the thing which is very obſervable, and which I mainly drive at, is this, That the *Roman* Church toward the latter end, before the Reformation broke out, had run ſo mad after the Patronage of the Virgin, that they had almoſt forgot the Son of God, and ſpent all their Devotions on her, whom they do at leaſt equalize to *Chriſt*, and ſo really make her, as well as ſome love to call her, the *Daughter of God*, in as high a ſenſe as *Chriſt* is his *Son*: as will farther appear in the proceſs of our Quotations. As in that Prayer to the bleſſed Virgin that follows in *Chemnitius*: *Te, mater illuminationis cordis mei, te, nutrix ſalutis meæ mentis, te obſecrant quantum poſſunt cuncta præcordia*

mea. Exaudi, Domina, adeſto propitia, adjuva potentiſſima, ut mundentur ſordes mentis meæ, ut illuminentur tenebræ meæ. O glorioſa Domina, Porta vitæ, Janua ſalutis, Via reconciliationis, Aditus recuperationis, obſecro te per ſalvatricem tuam fœcunditatem, fac ut peccatorum meorum venia & vivendi gratia concedatur, & uſque in finem hic ſervus tuus ſub tua protectione cuſtodiatur. Which Petition and Compellations, ſaving what belongs to the Sex, are moſt proper and natural to be uſed towards *Chriſt.* But the Virgin is here made our Saviour and Mediatour in the feminine gender.

5. As ſhe is again moſt expreſly in that Prayer to her in her Feaſt of Viſitation:

Veni, præcelſa Domina Maria; *tu nos viſita: Ægras mentes illumina Per ſacra vitæ munera.*

Veni, Salvatrix ſæculi; Sordes aufer piaculi; In viſitando populum Pœnæ tollas periculum.

Veni, Regina gentium; Dele flammas reatuum; Dele quodcunque devium; Da vitam innocentium.

In which Invocation the Virgin *Mary* is plainly called the Saviour of the World, and pray'd unto for ſpiritual Illumination of the Soul, and for the purgation thereof from the filth both of Sin and Guilt: whereby ſhe is plainly equallized to the *Son of God*, and made as it were a *She-Chriſt*, or *Daughter of God.*

To this ſenſe alſo are thoſe Prayers put up to her in her Feaſt of the Conception and of the Annunciation: But it were infinite to produce all. Read that Prayer in *Chemnitius* ſung to her by the Council of *Conſtance*: It is a perfect Imitation of the ancient Prayer of the Church to the Holy Ghoſt.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Upon the firſt Paragraph.

IN that Prayer to the bleſſed Virgin in this Paragraph are ſuch Compellations as if they were in the maſculine gender were onely proper for God and Chriſt, and ſuch things are asked as are in their power onely to give; which is a further Reply to his ſecond general Anſwer.

Upon the ſecond Paragraph.

And the very ſame may be ſaid of the Invocation in this ſecond Paragraph out of the ſame Roſary of the Virgin, which though my Adverſary ſeems deſirous to ſignifie his ſlighting of, yet he dare not deny but that it paſſes current with them. And why may I not produce what forms of Invocation I pleaſe which are allow'd amongſt them, and are made uſe of in the devotions of them that are of the Church of *Rome* ? For this does plainly prove the Idolatry that Chuch is lapſed into. But if ſome few flowers out of the *Hortulus Animæ* may be more gratefull to him, he ſhall find what will amount to as much as is in the above ſaid Roſary. For in a Recommendation to the bleſſed Virgin we read thus ; *I commend unto thee bleſſed Virgin, my whole Body and Soul and my whole life, the five ſenſes*

of my Body, all my actions and my death, who art with thy Son Chriſt bleſſed for ever and ever. What can be ſaid more to Chriſt or God himſelf? This is ſurely more than an *Ora pro nobis, Pray for us.* For in a Recommendation immediately going before, the form is: *Precor te, I pray thee, that thou wouldſt keep me from ſins, from ſcandals, from all the Confuſion of humane life, from unclean thoughts, from all perils of Soul and Body.* And ſome few leaves before in the *Canticum ad Virginem*, it is ſaid, *Dignare dulcis* Maria *nunc & ſemper nos ſine delicto cuſtodire. O ſweet* Mary *vouchſafe to keep us now and for ever without ſin.* As if they had a mind to turn the *Te Deum*, into a *Te Deam*; and indeed in this Canticle they have indeavoured it as near as they can. But this in it *verbatim* Anſwers to, *Vouchſafe to keep us this day without ſin*, in the *Te Deum.* I will cloſe all with that Rhyme in their *Oratio ad beatam* Mariam.

Eſto cuſtos cordis mei,
Signa me timore Dei,
Confer vitæ Sanctitatem
Et da morum honeſtatem;
Da peccata me vitare
Et quod juſtum eſt amare,
O Dulcedo Virginalis
Nunquam fuit nec eſt talis.

Can any one be the keeper of ones heart but God that knows the heart? This therefore is ſuch a ſweet ſtrain of Devotion as never was heard till

till the lapſe of the Church into groſs Idolatry. And yet all this and a great deal more is in that *Hortulus Animæ*, which queſtionleſs is a moſt delicious Paradiſe with thoſe of that Church, and has a ſufficient ſtamp of Authority upon it. Which I ſpeak in reference to his third general Anſwer. Nor have I gathered any examples of Invocation but ſuch as the Author I have them out of does expreſly profeſs to have been confirmed by publick Authority, and to have been in publick uſe. See *Chemnitius* his third part of the Examination of the Council of *Trent*, *pag.* 135. I do not profeſs to have all their Rituals, and Pontificals and Roſaries by me, but what I have by me and under my eye are ſo like what *Chemnitius* has produced, that I think it the greateſt folly and ſtupidity in the World to misbelieve his Quotations.

Upon the third Paragraph.

As for Example in the Invocation in this Paragraph, *Cor meum illumina fulgens ſtella* Maris; why ſhould I at leaſt doubt of that form, when I have before mine eyes in *Hortulus Animæ*; *Eſto cuſtos cordis mei, Signa me timore Dei.* Out of both which in the mean time there may be a further Reply to his ſecond general Anſwer, or an Inſtance of one of thoſe Generals in my general Reply to that Anſwer.

Upon the fourth Paragraph.

That I take notice, that these Invocations imply that the Virgin *Mary* is the daughter of God, is in reference to my *Exposition* of the Epistle to the Church of *Thyatira*, which the Reader, if his Genius lead him to such things, may please to peruse. But in the mean time they implying so plainly that the Virgin is the daughter of God in such a kind of sense as Christ is his Son, it plainly appears from hence, that the Invocation is not a mere *Ora pro nobis*, or the Praying for such things as are not greater then is in the power of any Creature to give; which therefore again is a further Reply to the second and last general Answers.

Upon the fifth Paragraph.

Besides that she is again in this Invocation made the daughter of God in that high sense, and that the same Arguments that prove her Titles bigger imply the boons she can bestow to be greater then what is competible to a mere Creature, and so it respects the second general Answer of my Adversary: It is plain also from *veni* and *visita*, that it is impossible to be understood of a mere *Ora pro nobis*, contrary to my Adversaries last Answer. And lastly it is to be observed in reference to his third general Answer, that this song in her Feast of Visitation must be in the number of those forms, *quæ publicè in Ecclesiis leguntur & magnis loatibus proclamantur*

as

Chemnitius speaks. And the like is to be said of her Feast of Conception, and Annunciation, in Reply to the said third general Answer. As also of that Prayer sung to her at the Council of *Constance*, in imitation of *Veni Creator Spiritus*, as that in *Hortulus Animæ* is of *Te Deum Laudamus*. And why should I doubt of that when I see this before mine eyes? But instead of *Veni Creator Spiritus*, which is the usual Prayer to the Holy Ghost; it is here,

Veni mater Gratiæ,
Fons misericordiæ,
Miseris Remedium;
Veni lux Ecclesiæ,
Tristibus lætitiæ
Nunc infunde radium, &c.

And now let any one judge whether these are the words of suppliants onely saying, *Ora pro nobis*. For whereas it is said, *Veni lux Ecclesiæ, Nunc infunde radium*; *O come thou light of the Church, Now infuse thy rayes*; This is both a calling her to them not a bidding her pray for them in Heaven, and also the styling her the light of the Church and upon that account Praying her to illuminate them, it is plain they suppose her from her self to shine forth upon them. And the like might have been observed in that Form, Paragraph 3. *Cor meum illumina fulgens stella Maris*. So manifest over and over again is it, That those formes of the Invocation of the Saints must be more than an *Ora pro nobis*, against his last general Answer.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

More Forms of Invocation of the bleſſed Virgin out of the Mary-Pſalter, *ſo called, extremely Idolatrous and Blaſphemous.*

1. WE will now onely note ſome paſſages in the *Mary-Pſalter*, as it is called, wherein how much at that time the Church of *Rome* had thruſt themſelves under the Protection and Patronage of the Virgin, and made her the Daughter of God, inſtead of approving themſelves faithfull touching the Rights and Prerogatives of the Son and his Worſhip, will be moſt notoriouſly evident. I will begin with the thirtieth Pſalm: *In te, Domina, ſperavi; non confundar in æternum. In gratiam tuam ſuſcipe me; inclina ad me aurem tuam, & in mœrore meo lætifica me. Tu es fortitudo mea & refugium meum, conſolatio mea & protectio mea: ad te clamavi cùm tribularetur cor meum, & exaudiſti de vertice collium æternorum. In manus tuas, Domina, commendo ſpiritum meum, meam totam vitam, diem ultimum.* This is that whole Pſalm to the Virgin: juſt in ſuch a form and with ſuch a repoſe of ſpirit as *David* prays in to God himſelf.

2. But we will content our ſelves with tranſcribing onely ſome ſelect pieces. As Pſalm 71. *Reſperge, Domina, cor meum dulcedine tua. Fac me ob'iviſci miſerias hujus vitæ: Concupiſcentias æternas excita in anima mea, & de gaudio Paradiſi inebria mentem meam.* And again, Pſalm 104. *Salus ſempiterna in manu tua eſt, Domina, qui te dignè honoraverint ſuſcipient illam. Clementia tua non deficiet à ſeculis æternis, & miſericordia tua à generatione in generationem.* And Pſalm 117. *Diſpoſitione tua mundus perſeverat, quem tu, Domina, cum Deo fundaſti*

ab

ab initio. Tuus totus ego ſum, Domina; ſalvum me fac, quoniam deſiderabiles ſunt laudes tuæ in tempore peregrinationis meæ. No man can ſay more to, or expect more from, the eternal God himſelf.

Whence they make the eternal Godhead as hypoſtatically united with the Virgin as with *Chriſt* himſelf, and carry themſelves to her as if ſhe were as properly the *Daughter of God* as he *the Son.* For elſe how could ſhe be ſaid to have everlaſting Salvation inher power, and to have laid the Foundations of the world from the beginning with the eternal Deity?

3. There are alſo other paſſages in this Pſalter whereby they make the Virgin *Mary* a *She-Chriſt*, the *Daughter of God*, as he is the *Son of God*; and that is by the applying of the very Phraſes ſpoken of him in the Scripture, unto her. As in Pſalm 2. *Venite ad eam omnes qui laboratis & tribulati eſtis, & refrigerium & ſolatium dabit animabus veſtris.* And Pſalm 81. *Terge fœditatem meam, Domina, quæ ſemper rutilas puritate. Fons vitæ, influe in os meum, ex quo viventes aquæ profluunt & emanant. Omnes ſitientes venite ad illam, & de fonte ſuo gratanter vos potabit.* This is the gift of the Spirit, belonging onely to *Chriſt* to give to them that believe on him. And he is alſo ſaid (*John* 7. 37, 38.) to be the *eaſe* and *reſt* of all them that are *weary and heavy laden*, Matth. 11. 28.

And again, Pſalm 46. *Omnes gentes, plaudite manibus, pſallite in jubilo Virgini glorioſæ. Quoniam ipſa eſt porta vitæ, janua ſalutis, & via noſtræ reconciliationis, ſpes pœnitentium, ſolamen lugentium, pax beata cordium atque ſalus.* This is attributed to the Virgin, when as it is *Chriſt* alone that is the way of Salvation and Reconciliation with God.

4. This is a foul and tedious Subject, and therefore to make an end at length, let us conſider the Blaſphemy of the 41. Pſalm. *Quemadmodum deſiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum, ità ad amorem tuum anhelat anima mea,*

Virgo

Virgo ſancta. Quia tu es genitrix vitæ meæ, & altrix reparationis carnis meæ: Quia tu lactatrix Salvationis animæ meæ, initium & finis totius ſalutis meæ. Here is that attributed to the Virgin which is ſaid of *Chriſt*, that he is the Author and Finiſher of our Faith and Salvation. Nay, the Creation or Generation of our life and fleſh, as well as our Salvation, is here aſcribed to the Virgin. Which can have no ſenſe or truth, unleſs ſhe were Θεόγυνη, *God-woman*, in that ſenſe that *Chriſt* is Θεάνθρωπος or Θεάνηρ, *God-man*, and as I ſaid, were as properly the *Daughter of God* as he is the *Son of God.*

5. As ſhe is expreſly called in her Litany, *Filia Dei*, the *Daughter of God.* Which, conſidering what high Titles they give her both in that Litany and elſewhere, as *Illuminatrix cordium, Fons miſericordiæ, Flumen ſapientiæ, Mater Dei, Regina cœli, Domina mundi, Domina cœli & terræ*, would be but a dwindling Title, (it belonging to all women that are believers,) if there was not ſome ſuch raiſed and ſublime ſenſe of it as I have intimated.

And therefore their Addreſſes to her being as if ſhe were, as I ſaid, a *She-Chriſt*, and the *Daughter of God* in as high a ſenſe at leaſt as *Chriſt* is the *Son of God*, and ſhe being called the Daughter of God in the *Litania Mariæ*, in her Litany or publick Supplication to her, it is plain, that in that Interval of the Church wherein this moſt conſpicuouſly and notoriouſly happened, the Church of *Rome*, by reaſon alſo of the abundance of their Devotions then to the Virgin, might be ſaid to be rather the Worſhippers of the *Daughter of God* then of *the Son of God.* And that therefore the Spirit of Prophecy foreſeeing theſe times, whenas for ſuch a ſpace he called *Rome Pergamus*, this ſucceeding Scene coming on, he might very well change the Title of *Pergamus* into that of *Thyatira*, with a deriſorious Alluſion to the occaſion of the name of that City, from the

news

news of a Daughter being born to *Nicanor*. As if God Almighty had the like occaſion of changing the name of *Pergamus* into *Thyatira*, from the *Romaniſts* turning the Virgin *Mary* into the *Daughter of God*.

6. For a ſtop to which Inſolency *Chriſt* ſeems on purpoſe in the Epiſtle to the Church in *Thyatira* to reſume to himſelf the Title of the *Son of God*, *Apoc.* 2. 18. notwithſtanding that he is called the *Son of man* in the Viſion in the foregoing Chapter, *Apoc.* 1. 13. out of which he ever draws a deſcription of himſelf for an Entrance before each Epiſtle to the Churches. Which, in my judgement, is a thing ſpecially well worth the marking; and that this making the Virgin *Mary* the *Daughter of God* in this Interval, might alone be a ſufficient occaſion of changing the name of the Church of *Rome* from *Pergamus* to *Thyatira*. But other things that are appoſite are alſo comprehended by a Prophetical *Henopœia*.

7. But this is an Overplus to our Preſent purpoſe, which was mainly to diſcover the groſs Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* in the Invocation of their Saints, and eſpecially of the Virgin *Mary*; and how both the Definition of the Council of *Trent* is Idolatrous in this Point, and much more the Practice of the Church countenanced by publick Authority.

8. For this *Mary-Pſalter* it ſelf, that has the moſt enormous and blaſphemous Forms of Idolatrous Invocation of any, is not the private Contrivance of ſome ſingle, obſcure, ſuperſtitious Monk, but bears the Title of that Seraphick Doctor St. *Bonaventure*, once Cardinal of *Rome*: Which is no ſmall publick countenance thereto. And that nothing might be wanting to the grace and furtherance of ſo devotional a piece of Idolatry, there was inſtituted a peculiar Society, entitled the *Fraternity of the Mary-Pſalter*, confirmed afterward by *Sixtus* the fourth, many Indulgences being added *Anno* 1470. And *Innocent* the eighth added to theſe Indulgences

gences plenary Remiſſion *à pœna & culpa* once in their life, and once *in articulo mortis*, to as many as entred into that Fraternity.

9. And in ſuch caſe ſtands the Church of *Rome* at this very day, that is to ſay, ſhe is ſtill *Thyatira*, notorious for her Idolatrous Worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*. But the Interval of the true Church in *Thyatira* ceaſed upon the Reformation, when we caſt off the Pope, or ſuffered *Jezebel* to delude the Servants of God no longer, nor to debauch them with Idolatrous Modes of Worſhip. But this is onely by the bye.

In the mean time it is abundantly manifeſt, that the Invocation of Saints in the *Roman* Church is not onely the praying to them that they would pray to God for us, but the asking Aids of them, and ſuch frequently as are in the power of none but of God, and of *Chriſt* as he is God, for to give; and therefore is ſtill the groſſer Idolatry.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Upon the firſt Paragraph.

IT is obſervable that as the *Canticum* to the Virgin in *Hortulus Animæ* is an Imitation of *Te Deum Laudamus*, and the Prayer ſung to her by the Council of *Conſtance* an Imitation of the Hymn to the Holy Ghoſt, *Veni Creator Spiritus*: So is this Pſalm of the *Mary-Pſalter* an Imitation of the thirtieth Pſalm, which is a Prayer to God Almighty, to Jehovah himſelf; beginning, *In te Domine ſperavi non confundar in æternum.* Which is Verbatim here applied to the Virgin *Mary*, and there is no change of the word *Dominus*, but putting *Domina* for it, which changes onely the gender not the ſignification. As if it had been *Deus* and they ſhould have turned it *Dea*. And *Dominus* (which is ſo tranſlated from the Greek κύριος, which in this ſenſe ſome Criticks, if I remember right, deduce from κυρῶ, which is εἰμὶ or ὑπάρχω (*to be*) that κύριος may Anſwer to *Jehovah*, *Eſſentiator*) ſignifies here not a Lord in a civil ſenſe, but is the ſame that *Jehovah* and κύριος, God the Creator and Eſſentiator of all things, or that which is the Fountain of all Eſſence and is Eſſence it ſelf neceſſary and eternal. This is *Dominus* in this Pſalm, and therefore to call the Virgin *Mary* here *Domina* with the reſt of the words of the beginning of this Pſalm, is as much as if they ſhould ſay, *In*

te

te Dea (in the higheſt ſenſe imaginable) *ſperavi, non confundar in perpetuum*, which is Idolatry of the deepeſt dye. To give ſuch an Attribute to the Creature, as implies the higheſt perfections that are in the Creator himſelf. Thus unadviſedly have they done, by making ſuch humourſom Imitations in words of ſuch Devotions as are proper alone to God. For to excuſe it by ſaying, they can put another ſenſe upon, it will not ſerve: For I dare ſay one may put ſuch a meaning on the whole Lords Prayer as that the words may be uſed to the Pope, with a continued coherence of ſenſe, partly proper, partly figurative, if ſuch ſhifts would ſerve the turn. And yet I hope none of the Church of *Rome* will ſtick to ſay, that, if one ſhould kneel to the Pope, and ſay the Lords Prayer to him, making him the Object thereof, but it would be apert blaſphemy and Idolatry. But we proceed; And as for *Exaudiviſti de vertice collium æternorum*, it is another Privilege too big for a Creature, as if the Virgin were omniſcient. But the whole form of the Devotion is ſuch, which I have already noted, as if it were *Davids* own Praying to God himſelf, and not an *Ora pro nobis*, againſt his laſt general Anſwer; as what went before was againſt his ſecond.

Upon the ſecond Paragraph.

And in Reply again to the ſame ſecond Anſwer, Here is alſo attributed to the bleſſed Virgin what is too big for any Creature, *Everlaſting*

ing ſalvation is ſaid to be *in her*, Pſalm 104. And again, *Pſalm* 117. *Domina ſalvum me fac*, if underſtood of eternal ſalvation as my Adverſary underſtands it. But beſides this in theſe two *Pſalms* of the *Mary-Pſalter*, in further Reply to that part of his fifth general Anſwer that ſingles out *Domina ſalvum me fac* for the moſt harſh paſſage of all; In my mind *Clementia tua non deficiet à ſæculis æternis* ſeems more harſh, and to imply that her mercy is *ab æterno in æternum*, which no mercy can be but that of God alone. But, *Diſpoſitione tuâ Mundus perſeverat quam tu Domina cum Deo fundaſti ab initio*, does plainly make *Domina* our Lady, to be *Dominus Jehovah*, or the Æternal wiſdom, the Son of God by whom the world was really made and is governed. And this ſurely is far more harſh than *Domina ſalvum me fac*, againſt his fifth Anſwer.

Upon the third Paragraph.

That out of the ſecond *Pſalm* of the *Mary-Pſalter*, *Cleanſe my filthineſs O bleſſed Lady who always ſhineſt with purity, Flow into my mouth O fountain of life out of which proceed living waters.* How can this be a mere *Ora pro nobis*, it being ſo plainly an addreſs to the bleſſed Virgin to purifie her ſuppliant by her own purity, and to flow in upon him as being her ſelf the fountain of life, which is againſt his laſt Anſwer general.

Upon the fourth Paragraph.

The Compellations of the bleſſed Virgin in this Paragraph out of *Pſalm* 41. are too great for a mere Creature, and therefore may be inſtanced in by way of Reply to his ſecond general Anſwer.

Upon the fifth and ſixth Paragraphs.

Theſe two Paragraphs refer to my Expoſition of the Epiſtles to the ſeven Churches; which if the Reader have any inclination to ſuch ſpeculations and will peruſe them, he will read theſe and ſome few more Paragraphs of this my Antidote with more pleaſure.

Upon the ſeventh Paragraph.

That the Definition of the Council of *Trent* in this point is Idolatrous, is abundantly demonſtrated in the ſecond Paragraph of the fourth Chapter, from ſuch Concluſions as I have above plainly proved no aſſaults of my Adverſary have at all weakened. But the Acceſſions to make this Idolatry ſtill more groſs, is that it is ſo evident from theſe uſual forms of Invocation, that the Compellations of ſome of the Saints at leaſt are incompetible to any Creature, and they are asked ſuch things as no Creature is able to give, and ſo, as if they were to be given by themſelves and not by begging them of God for us.

Upon

Vpon the eighth Paragraph.

What is ſaid here may ſerve for a more full Reply to my Antagoniſts third general Anſwer, in that particular that concerns the *Mary-Pſalter*, it bearing this Authority and Authenticknes with it. For it goes under St. *Bonaventures* name, though I will not avow him to be the Authour of it. But the Countenance and Authority of two Popes is even more than enough to ratifie it for a genuine piece of devotion of the Church of *Rome*.

Vpon the ninth Paragraph.

To the former part of this ninth Paragraph, I have no more to ſay than what I have ſaid already on the fifth and ſixth. The ſecond part it is not impertinent to take notice what it intimates againſt the ſecond and laſt Anſwers of my Adverſary, *viz.* That I have not onely proved in theſe three Chapters that Invocation of Saints is Idolatry though it were onely for an *Ora pro nobis*, but alſo that according as the Council of *Trent* it ſelf doth inſinuate, there are ſpecial aids and helps, beſides praying for us, asked of the Saints, and ſo great ones, as alſo ſo great Compellations, as are incompetible to a mere Creature to give or receive; Which makes the Invocation twice or thrice more groſs than a mere *Ora pro nobis*. To all which you may laſtly add theſe aggravating Circumſtances which are very frequent, That theſe Invocations

are made at their Festivals in Temples, at Altars and Images consecrated to them, that nothing may be wanting to the most formal Idolatry imaginable. See Conclusion the eighteenth of the second Chapter.

We see therefore the gross Idolatry of the Romanists in the Invocation of Saints, even according to the allowance of the Council of *Trent* and the authorized practise of their Church, beyond all exception evidenced and demonstrated.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

That the Doctrine of the Council of Trent *touching the Worſhipping of Images is Idolatrous, and the Reaſon of the Doctrine weak and unſound.*

1. AND thus much for their Idolatry in the Invocation of Saints. Let us now conſider what the ſenſe of the Council of *Trent* is touching the worſhipping of Images. *Imagines porrò* Chriſti, *Deiparæ Virginis, & aliorum Sanctorum, in templis præſertim, habendas & retinendas eſſe, eiſque debitum honorem & reverentiam impertiendam. Quoniam honos qui eis exhibetur refertur ad Prototypa, quæ illæ repræſentant; ità ut per Imagines quas oſculamur, & coram quibus caput aperimus & procumbimus,* Chriſtum *adoremus, & Sanctos, quorum illæ ſimilitudinem gerunt, veneremur. Id quod Conciliorum, præſertim verè ſecundæ Nicænæ Synodi, Decretis contra Imaginum oppugnatores eſt ſancitum.* Concil. Trident. Sess. 9.

The meaning of which in brief is this, That the Images of *Chriſt*, of the bleſſed Virgin and other Saints, are to be had and retain'd in Churches, and that *due honour* and reverence is to be done to them. For which are produced two Reaſons. The firſt, In that the Honour that is done to the Images is referred to the Prototypes. The ſecond, In that this Injunction is but what the ſecond *Nicene* Council had of old decreed.

2. To which I anſwer, That thus much as the Council of *Trent* has declared touching Images is plain and open Idolatry by the ſeventh Concluſion of the firſt Chapter, and expreſly againſt the Commandment of God, who forbids us to make any graven Image to bow down to or Worſhip. But the Council of *Trent*

ſays, Yes, ye may make graven Images of the Saints, and ſet them up in their Temples, and give them their due Honour and Worſhip; nay, ye ought to do ſo; and inſtances in the very act of Bowing or Kneeling and proſtrating our ſelves before them. This Definition of the Council is ſo palpably againſt the Commandment of God, that they are fain to leave the ſecond Commandment out of the Decalogue, that the people may not diſcern how groſly they go againſt the expreſs Precepts of God in their ſo frequent practices of Idolatry. See the firſt, ninth and tenth Concluſions of the firſt Chapter; as alſo the third, fourth, fifth, eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth of the ſecond.

3. Nor can all their Tricks and Tergiverſations and ſubtil Eluſions ſerve their turn. For undoubtedly the Decalogue was writ to the eaſie capacity of the people, and therefore their hearts and conſciences are the beſt Interpreters. Not the fooliſh Evaſions and Subterfuges of perfidious Sophiſters, who, to the betraying of weak Souls to Idolatry and Damnation, and for the opening their Purſes, would make them believe that the Council of *Trent*'s enjoyning of Images in Churches, and the honouring them or worſhipping them and bowing down before them, can conſiſt with God's forbidding to make any graven Image, and to bow down to it and worſhip it. So that I ſay, the Council *it ſelf* does appoint flat Idolatry to the Chriſtian world to be practiſed. And it being ſo monſtrous a thing, I pray you now let us conſider the Reaſons why they do ſo.

4. The firſt is, Becauſe the Honour done to the Image is referr'd to the Prototype. But I anſwer, that this Reference is either in virtue of that Similitude the Images have with thoſe perſons they repreſent, which the words of the Council ſeem to imply, at leaſt touching the Saints, *quorum illæ ſimilitudinem gerunt*; as when we praiſe a Picture of ſuch or ſuch a perſon, that it is a very comely and

and lovely Picture, this praiſe naturally has a reference to the Perſon whoſe Picture it is, in virtue of the ſimilitude betwixt the Picture and the Party.

Or elſe this Reference, without any regard to perſonal Similitude, is from the Direction of the Intention of the Devotioniſt, that he intends upon the ſeeing and bowing, ſuppoſe, to the Image of *Chriſt*, the bleſſed Virgin, or any Saint, to take this occaſion to worſhip *Chriſt*, the bleſſed Virgin or the Saint thereby, the Image being but at large a ſymbolical Preſence of them, it being not regarded whether the Symbol or Image have any perſonal Similitude with the party it repreſents or no.

5. But now as for the former it is evident, that it is infinitely uncertain whether any Image of *Chriſt*, the bleſſed Virgin, or of this or that Saint, be like the carnal figure of theſe perſons while they were alive upon earth, or no. Nay, it is in a manner certain to the contrary, none of theſe holy Souls being given to ſuch follies as to have their Pictures drawn while they were alive. See my *Myſtery of Iniquity*, Part I. Book I. chap. 14.

But being it is extremely improbable but an Image ſhould be like ſome or other, that are either now alive, or have lived on the earth ſince the beginning of the world, according to this firſt ſuppoſition, this Honour or religious Worſhip intended to *Chriſt*, the bleſſed Virgin, or any other Saint, will not onely miſs them, but certainly fall on ſome other who, in ſtead of being Saints, haply are or have been very vile and wicked perſons.

6. But beſides, no Saints are worſhipped before they be in Heaven, nor indeed are properly Saints till then; and the Glories in their Pictures that are about their Heads ſhew plainly that they intend to repreſent the Saints in their preſent condition of Glory in Heaven. Whence it is plain that the Images are nothing like them they are made for. For how can theſe Images of braſs or ſtone or wood, or any other materials, bear the Image of a ſeparate Soul,

which all the Saints are for the preſent? And what likeneſs can there be betwixt the glorious body of *Chriſt* Heavenly and ſpiritual, and an Image of any terreſtrial matter? No more than betwixt a piece of Dirt or Soot and the Sun or bright Morning-ſtar.

And, which is moſt of all to be conſidered, what terreſtrial Image can poſſibly repreſent him that is truly Θεάνθρωπος, *God-man*, and is not the Object of our Adoration but as he is this Divine *Complexum* as well of the *Divinity* as the *Humanity*? But what Statuary can carve out the Effigies of the Deity? So that the pretenſe of this Reference of the Honour to the Prototype in this firſt ſenſe thereof is very weak and vain. Nor, though there were this natural Reference, would it follow that we are to honour them this way, it being ſo plainly forbid, and there being better ways then this, *viz.* the commemorating and imitating their Vertues.

7. And for that ſecond ſenſe, it is indeed diſinvolved of thoſe former Difficulties; but greater here occurr. For as touching our Saviour *Chriſt*, foraſmuch as his pretended Image is but his ſymbolical Preſence, the doing of Divine Worſhip towards it is again plain Idolatry, as appears by that Example of the *Iſraelites*, who worſhipped the golden Calf in reference to *Jehovah*, as appears plainly in the Story, *Exod.* 32. 4, 5. And for the bleſſed Virgin and the reſt of the Saints, that Incurvation toward their ſymbolical Preſences is flat Idolatry, is manifeſt from the eighth, ninth and tenth Concluſions of the firſt Chapter, and the fifth, nineteenth and twentieth of the ſecond of this Treatiſe.

And indeed thus to make the Images of the Saints ſo called onely their ſymbolical Preſences, and ſo to Worſhip them before theſe Images, is an attributing Divine Honour to them. For this naturally does declare that they have at leaſt a terreſtrial Omnipreſency, which no inviſible Power which we know has but onely God. But to make a low

low Obeiſance to an abſent perſon God knows how many *millions* of miles off, is ſtill a more forced and ridiculous thing. And therefore the ſaluting of the Saints thus at their ſymbolical Preſences or Images, and in the mean time acknowledging them to be *in ſede Beatorum*, (which they do, and muſt do, unleſs they exclude them Heaven,) is to acknowledge one Soul to fill Heaven and Earth with its preſence, which is that vaſt Privilege of God Almighty onely; and therefore this Worſhip to them is groſs Idolatry, as ſuppoſing ſuch a Perfection in them as is no-where but in God.

Beſides what was intimated before, that let this Reference be what it will, there being an Incurvation or Proſtration before Images, whether they be mere Symbols or exact Repreſentations, it muſt be *ipſo facto* dolatry by the ſeventh Concluſion of the firſt Chapter. From whence it follows, that the Saints are not honoured by this worſhipping of their Images, but hideouſly reproached, it ſuppoſing them to be pleaſed and gratify'd with that which is an abomination to the Lord, and a groſs tranſgreſſion of his expreſs Commands. It implies, I ſay, that they are ambitious, vain glorious and rebellious againſt God. And therefore they that the moſt vehemently oppoſe this way of honouring of them by Images and Invocations are the moſt true and faithfull Honourers of them, they ſo zealouſly vindicating them from the great Reproaches theſe others caſt upon them. So far are they from being guilty herein of any Rudeneſs or Clowniſhneſs againſt the Saints of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

His Answer to the first part of the second Paragraph.

There was no Answer to be given to the first Paragraph, it being merely the setting down what the Council of Trent *defines about the worshipping of Images. But to the first part of the second Paragraph his Answer is this; Here the Doctor, says he, gives us a learned Antithesis betwixt the Commandment of God and Decree of this Council. But how weak, frivilous and Pharisaical this Antithesis is, I have sufficiently declared in my Answer to the second and seventh Conclusions of the first Chapter. This is his whole Answer to this part of the Paragraph.*

The Reply.

AS to that he says it is a learned Antithesis, I Reply, That it is a plain, conspicuous and obvious Antithesis, so obvious, that it has caused your Church to hide the second Commandment from the sight of the Vulgar. To the ill language you give me I Reply nothing, but that of the Apostle. 1 *Pet.* 3. 9. *Not railing for railing.* And for your pretended Answer to the second and seventh Conclusions of my first Chapter, I refer my Reader to my

my Reply to it, and appeal to his judgement if it be not ſatisfactory.

His Anſwer to the ſecond part of this ſecond Paragraph.

He uſes long ambages and circuits in his Anſwer to this ſecond part, but the main matter occurs in the the end of his Anſwer, which is this, That I ought to have proved that which I call the ſecond *to be a Commandment really diſtinct from the* firſt; *And that the underſtanding is not the ſame whether we divide the Precepts of the firſt Table into three or into four Commandments. This he abſolutely omitting to do, ſaith he, his charge proves a mere Calumny, and bearing falſe witneſs againſt his neighbour. And ſo while he pleads for his* ſecond, *he very uncharitably breaks his* ninth *Commandment.*

The Reply.

The whole frame of his Anſwer, if I had taken it from the beginning to the end, is ſo weak and ſlight, that I half ſuſpect he was invited to it merely for that laſt conceits ſake; to break a jeſt betwixt the ſecond and ninth precept upon his Adverſary. For firſt, though I ſhould admit the underſtanding would be the ſame though the firſt Table were divided but into three Commandments, ſo no words of the firſt Table were left out; nay though the firſt Table were called one Commandment or Decree touching our duty towards God, yet my charge

charge against the Church of *Rome* for leaving out so great and so material a part of this Decree, or of the first Commandment if you will, would not be a jot mitigated thereby, the understanding being the same, as my Antagonist himself confesses, whether it be held one Commandment, or two. For if it be held one Commandment yet it is plainly divisible into these two parts which we call the first and second Commandments. And this that we call the second Commandment, and you the second part of the first Commandment, being really one and the same, and you acknowledging you leave out that part of the Commandment, where then is the Calumny? any more then if one should accuse another that he took away two shillings six pence, and he should Reply, it is an unworthy slander, it was onely half a crown that he took away: would not this to any indifferent judge seem a very pleasant Apology to clear one of the Theft?

But now in the second place, Though St. *Austin* and St. *Hierome* (*Peter Lombard* says it is *Origen* and *Austin*) may differ in their Opinion about the first and second Commandment, whether they be one or two Commandments, yet I presume the more ancient, and the more general sense of the Church is that they are two. And it is well known that *Origen* flourished long before *Austin*: But it is acknowledged of all hands out of the word of God, that there are just ten Commandments, neither more nor less. Now the Church of *Rome* that would have the first Table consist but of three

three Commandments, is conſtrained to divide the laſt Commandment into two; which is againſt the Antiquity of the diſtinction of the Greek and Hebrew Text into verſes. For it is obſervable that both in the Greek and Hebrew Text, though the length of ſome of the Commandments has occaſioned them to be divided into more verſes than one, yet they no where have crouded two Commandments into one verſe; in ſo much that they make, *Thou ſhalt not kill, Thou ſhalt not commit adultery, Thou ſhalt not ſteal*, three diſtinct verſes. Whence it is plain that that which we call the tenth Commandment is really but one Commandment, as being contained in one verſe; and that, *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbours wife*, is not a whole Commandment diſtinct from the reſt contained in that verſe.

Beſides, which is hugely remarkable; if, *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbours wife*, be one intire Commandment, *viz.* the *ninth*; part of the tenth Commandment, *viz. Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbours houſe*, is ſet before it, which is not a thing credible. But there is no abſurdity nor inconvenience, ſuppoſing it but one Commandment, that, *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbours houſe*, is ſet firſt in *Exodus*, and, *Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbours wife*, is placed firſt in *Deuteronomy*. This methinks ſhould be enough to the impartial to demonſtrate, that that which we uſually call the tenth Commandment, is not to be divided into two but is all one entire Commandment; and that therefore the firſt and ſecond Commandments ordinarily

rily so called cannot be one Commandment but two, that there may be ten.

To all which you may add, that but even a moderate smattering in Logick may easily discover the tenth Commandment usually so called to be but one, and the first and second Commandments so called to be really two; namely, from the consideration of their Objects. Now the Object in the tenth Commandment is but one in General, *viz.* the keeping our desires from other mens goods of what nature soever, *Thou shalt not covet any thing that is his*; That is the general of the whole Commandment plainly: And House, Wife, Servant, Oxe, Asse, are but particulars belonging to this general, and by the same reason that you make an intire Commandment of any one of these Particulars, you may of every one of them, and so divide the last Commandment at least into five, which is very absurd. But as the Object of the tenth Commandment shows it can be but one, so the Objects of the first and second plainly show they must be two Commandments, because their Objects are distinctly two. The first having for its Object the onely one true God whom alone to retain we are plainly taught or commanded by that Precept; the second having for its Object Graven Images or whatsoever similitudes of things, which we are strictly forbid any way to worship. So plain every way is it, That that which we call the second Commandment is the second Commandment, and that there is not the least show of calumny, in saying, They have left

our

out the ſecond Commandment in their Catechiſms.

But yet it is further obſervable, that if the firſt and ſecond Commandments were to be held but one Commandment, there can be no ſo rational ground as this, That the ſecond has a cloſe ſubſerviency to the firſt, and that it is added that we may keep the firſt more intirely and have no more Gods in any ſenſe, than one: Which implies therefore that worſhipping of Images Gods does interpret as the making more Gods to our ſelves then one, or that it is a neceſſary Concomitant of making to our ſelves more Gods then one, as is too too apparent in the Religion of the Gentiles, nor can be enough lamented in degenerated Chriſtendom. Which eagerneſs after Idol-Gods the true God moſt ſeverely prohibits, and ſhow's himſelf ſo much the more ſolicitous and zealous here againſt worſhipping of Images, by reaſon of the great Proclivity of mankind to that more than to Polytheiſme, or the not believing that there is onely one *ſupreme* God the Creatour and Governour of all things. But the great danger is, that acknowledging this, yet they may either defile his Worſhip with Images, and make thoſe Images Gods by worſhipping them, or Worſhip *Dæmons* and *Saints* in Images and Pictures, and ſo according to the cuſtom of the Heathens make more Gods than one, though but one ſupreme and others inferiour to him. There is ſuch a pruriency and precipitant inclination in humane nature to theſe ſuperſtitions, that to put a ſtop to it God addes ſuch a rouſing

rousing Commination at the latter end of this second Commandment or the second part of the first, as my Adversary would have it. *For I am a jealous God that visits the iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children to the third and fourth Generation of them that hate me*; As if he declared them more particularly μισυγεῖς *haters* of God as well as *hatefull* to him who will presume so hainously to affront him as to make Images to Worship them or any Object by them.

Which second Commandment therefore with this direfull Commination added to it, being so effectual a bar and so point blank against the Idolatry practised in the *Roman* Church, my Adversary must give me leave to suspect, that it is not, as he says, left out to ease the memory of the Vulgar of so long a lesson, but to obliterate it out of their mind and memory, or rather to never let them have the sight of that which would certainly make their Consciences tremble when they saw the practises of the Church which they are obliged to, so plainly contrary to the word of God. But that they have also left out the tenth and eleventh verses about the Sabbath, that may be for a better blind for this, and also that people may not be imbrued with an over religious regard to the Lords day, least they should find offence at the licentiousness of that day too, and note that many Saints days are more solemnly kept, then that wherein the Creation of the world and Redemption by God our great Saviour and Redeemer is celebrated at once. But I have insisted on this Argument

longer

longer than I intended. I hope long before this the discerning Reader perceives, That the crime lyes where it did, and that my charge in this point is no Calumny.

His Answer to the fourth Paragraph.

My third Paragraph he passes over sicco pede, *nor excerps any thing out of it, lest it should prove too wholsome food for his misled Party. But to my fourth Paragraph he answers thus,* (p. 74. 75.) *Then he supposing, saith he, that neither of these are maintainable, he infers that by no means can the honour done to the Image be referred to the Prototype or Thing represented. But to the Argument I Answer, That this Reference is in vertue of that similitude which the Image has with the Prototype as including the direction of the Intention of the Devotionist* ipso facto, *that is supposed to be a rational Agent. And therefore the Doctours disjunctive* Dilemma *is very vain and defective. This is his Answer in general to my disjunctive* Dilemma, *as he calls it. But before this Answer he unmethodically propounds my Arguments against the first member of the* Dilemma. *But I shall reduce all to the order of my Paragraphs; and Reply to this general Answer first.*

The Reply.

I say therefore, That there is a great defect and mistake of my Adversary in his not apprehending

the full ſcope of my Argument. For it is not merely to prove that the Honour done to the Image cannot be any of theſe two ways referred to the Prototype, but that it cannot be referred ſo as to quit the Act of Idolatry, as I have intimated at the end of the ſixth Paragraph, and at the beginning of the laſt part of the ſeventh. Now there being but two ways of referring this honour to the Prototype, and the Council ſeeming to inſinuate a fitneſs from the ſimilitude of the Images to their Prototypes, I mainly impugne that in my fifth and ſixth Paragraph, his Anſwer to which we ſhall here omit. But for the ſenſe of his preſent Anſwer in general to the *Dilemma*, if I underſtand him it is this, That there being a ſimilitude of *ſignification* as well as of *figure* (as he tells us anon) which is implied in the direction of the Intention of the Devotioniſt, and that therefore repreſents the Prototype to his mind, whether there be ſimilitude of figure or no, that this makes my *Dilemma* vain and defective, as disjoyning or dividing thoſe things one from another, that are found together in every reference of the Devotioniſt. This is the beſt ſenſe I can make of his perplext and obſcure Anſwer; To which I Reply, That although there be that ſimilitude of ſignification (though in the mean time it be very improperly ſo called) included in the intention or mind of the Devotioniſt in the referring of the Image to the Prototype, and ſo is a kind of note of remembrance to him, yet being ſometimes, this thing may be like the thing which it is a note of, and have the ſimilitude

of *Figure* as well as of *Signification*, and sometimes merely the similitude of *Signification*, it is plain there is ground enough to raise this bipartition of Reference of the Image to the Prototype, it being sometimes of Images that have merely *similitudinem Significationis*, sometimes of those that have *similitudinem Figuræ* also, which the Council insinuating some greater fitness in, I impugne in the abovesaid Paragraphs. In the mean time to them that understand *Logick*, it is plain that my *Dilemma* is neither vain nor defective.

His Answer to the fifth Paragraph.

I argue in this Paragraph against the referring the honour done to the Image unto the Prototype by vertue of similitude. 1. *Because it is uncertain whether the Figure of Christ the blessed Virgin and the rest have any likeness to them.* 2. *And that it is hugely probable they may be like some body else and those none of the best. To the former he Answers, That the honour done to the Image may be referred to the Prototype, though there be no personal similitude of* Figure *betwixt the Image and the Person it represents, but onely the similitude of* Signification, *the Image signifying the Dignity, Gravity, or other perfections of the Prototype. And this similitude of Signification he would prove to be where there is no personal similitude of Figure, because man is said to be made after the likeness of God though there be no personal similitude of Figure betwixt them. And he who honours man,*

saith he, as he is the image of God, honours God in his Image. And if therefore where no similitude of Figure, *much more where a* specifical *similitude of* Figure, *the honour done to the Image may be referred to the Prototype, as it happens in the Case of the Images of Christ and his Saints.*

To the second he Answers, that the Case the Doctor puts is more than possible. Because the Images of the Angels or Cherubims over the Ark had no personal similitude with the Angels but with some terrestrial Creatures, yet the honour done to them was referred to the Prototypes.

The Reply.

To the former I Reply, That the honour done to the *Image* may be referred to the *Prototype* (or rather that to which the Image is erected) though there be no similitude of *Figure*. But I deny that any such honour or Worship can be done to the Image with reference to the Prototype without Idolatry, as I have declared and proved in my seventh Paragraph. And now this hitherto being the safest Answer my Adversary can make, I understand not why he should not stick to it and balk the first part of my *Ditemma*, but that he has a mind to infuse Idolatry by what follows in his Answer to this Paragraph, into his heedless and credulous party. Whereunto tends also the proof of his Assertion, That there may be a similitude of signification where there is no similitude of personal Figure, from, *Let us make man after our own Image.*

Image. As if that the personal similitude betwixt God and Man mentioned in the Scripture respected that of external Figure, and therefore could be onely of *Signification*; whenas it is understood of internal righteousnes and true holines, this is the Image of God in which man was created; In which there is not onely a similitude of *Signification*, but of real and personal likeneſs. But this was onely to bring in that fly saying, *He who honours man as he is the Image of God, honours God in his Image.* Whenas there is no man honours man in reference to God as you pretend to honour the Image of Christ terminating your Worship in him. But we do civil honour onely to men, and in bowing to them onely signifie our inclination and readines to do them all good offices of love service and in the mean time acknowledge there is that in them that is worthy of civil honour and esteem. And lastly, I say, as to the pretense of *specifick* similitude of *Figure*, it signifies no more as to the intended honour of an *Individual*, then if there were no similitude at all. Τὸ γὰρ μὴ ἓν σημαίνειν ἴσον σημαίνειν ἐστίν. For not to signifie one determinate thing is to signifie nothing, as *Aristotle* says. But by vertue of *the direction of our intention*, we may make any thing signifie any thing.

To the second I Reply, That if the Case the Doctor puts be more than possible, then it is probable or possible, so that he yields what I would have. But I will not yield him that he has brought a fit instance, or that he has spoke right in that Instance. For neither were these Cherubims intend-

ded for the symbolical presence of Angels but of God, nor was any honour done to the Cherubims or their Prototypes, although here again he slily would infuse this poyson of Idolatry into his ignorant Party, though with a reproach to God and *Moses*.

His Answer to the sixth Paragraph.

To the first part of this Paragraph he Answers; That the Images of the Saints represent them such as they were upon Earth, onely with an additional mark of a Crown *or* Lawrel *to signifie their triumphant state in Glory; And then, That an Image may be like to a separate Soul as well as to an Angel or Cherubim, he would infer from that Opinion of the* Platonists, *who make separate Souls invested with aereall or æthereal Vehicles as well as the Angels.*

To the second he Answers, that if a terrestrial Image cannot represent that Person who is θεάνθρωπος God-man, *then neither can a terrestrial eye represent him, and so the Apostles whilest living did never see that Person who was* θεάνθρωπος God-man, *which is no less then blasphemy; as implying that that Person called Jesus Christ whom the Apostles daily beheld with their eyes, was not* θεάνθρωπος God-man.

The Reply.

To the first I Reply, That unless my Adversary here suppose what he can never make good, that they have the true effigies of the Saints such as they were upon Earth, he is never the near (as to

to this firſt curioſity) whether he phancy them repreſented ſuch as they were on Earth, or ſuch as they are now in Heaven. But being Religious Worſhip is not due to them till they be *canonized*, to repreſent them ſuch as they were on Earth, is to repreſent them in Order to Religious Worſhip, ſuch as they were before they were capable of Religious Worſhip. And the *Lawrel* and *Crown* he talks of, thoſe are not on their Images or Statues, but onely a Glory over their Heads in their Pictures, ſo far as I remember, of which the genuine ſignification is, That that picture ſtands for them ſuch as they are now in glory, and there is the ſame ſenſe of their Statues and of their Pictures. Moreover, his ſuppoſal is falſe and contrary to his own Aſſertion before, when he aſſerts that the Images of Cherubims or Angels are like in Figure to the Angels themſelves, as if there were Ox-headed and Lyon-headed Angels. And laſtly, ſuppoſe we ſhould be ſo courteous as to grant him the doctrine of the *Platoniſts* that Souls ſeparate have aereal or æthereal Vehicles, what would this advantage him they allowing no ſettled Figure to them? And if there were an *humane* Figure allowed, when we have no knowledge what was their *individual* terreſtrial Figure, how ſhall we know what is their aereal or æthereal? And though the Figure was known, what terreſtrial matter can expreſs that lively enraviſhing ſpiritual beauty that is in thoſe lucid Vehicles? So that though the Figure were ri[illegible] the form which is the life of the Figure would be quite loſt, and

be nothing near so like the separate Soul as the dead carcass of the greatest beauty on Earth, after four days lying in the grave, would be to the said party when alive. So that my Adversary in his Answer to this first part seems to indulge to humours and fetches of wit, rather than to reason soberly, and so as to prove a personal likeness betwixt the Saints and their Images.

And this in like sort may be said of his Answer to the second part, which is indeed an odd unexpected fetch of wit, but hugely rude and harsh, that would pretend to fix on my Argument the horrid crime of blasphemy, when it is in truth the asserting the transcendent excellency of the θεανθρωπία of Christ, not the denying of it, which were an hainous piece of blasphemy against the Son of God indeed. I say therefore that when I ask, *what terrestrial Image can possibly represent him that is truely* θεάνθρωπος *God-man?* that no mans mind that is not very extravagant could ever phancy that I meant any other Image, then what is external to our sight, which that in our eye is not. Again, it is manifest that I mean it of some Image that represents the absent, and *invisible* Humanity of Christ by reason of its absence; and not such an Image as a *Parelion* or a *Paraselene* are, that do not represent the Sun or Moon but by vertue of the presence of those *Luminaries.* Nor did the Image of Christ in the eyes of the Apostles or other men represent Christ any otherwise then by vertue of his Presence. But it is plain to any that will not cavil, that I understand

ſtand my own words of ſuch Images as repreſent the abſent, as the Statue of *Cæſar*, of *Virgil*, and the like. And then laſtly I flatly deny that the Image of an external Object in the eye, is *terreſtrial*. For the Image is not in the nervous bottom of the eye but butts onely upon it, as the Images let in upon white paper through a Hole in a dark room. That Image is not fixed nor ſubjected in the paper, but in the ethereal matter that touches the paper. And ſo the Image is in the ethereal matter that touches the bottom of the eye, not in the bottom of the eye it ſelf. But ethereal matter is not terreſtrial, and therefore this no terreſtrial Image.

Unto all which I add, That it does not follow but that, though the Image in the eye, call it *terreſtrial* or *ethereal*, had not the adequate or principal power of repreſenting Chriſt *God-man* to the Apoſtles when he was on Earth, yet, the preſence of our Saviour and the Divine graces of his Perſon ſhooting through that Image into the Souls and hearts of the beholders (faith being wrought in them by the ſpirit of God according to his eternal purpoſe; as it is written, *No man cometh to me, unleſs my Father draw him*) they might behold him and give that Teſtimony that St. *John* does of him, *John* 1. *The word was made fleſh and dwelt amongſt us, and we beheld the glory of him as the glory of the onely begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth.* But for others that ſaw the humane Preſence of him who is truly θεάνθρωπος, though they could not diſcern him to be ſuch or to be the Meſſias,

ſo

ſo far as they ſaw it chiefly to be imputed to his humanity being preſent, and not to the Image in the eye, which but for his Preſence could not repreſent him to the Soul. But I hope the wicked and unbeliever not diſcovering his θεανθρωπία does not at all argue him not to be θεάνθρωπον *God-man.* And now if the Image impreſſed by the very preſence of Chriſt had not not the natural Power of repreſenting that *Divine Complexum* God-man, according to both the natures, how far ſhort ſhall Images of wood or ſtone, or what ever materials be from repreſenting him being abſent?

In the mean time it is apparent how raſh and inhumane my Antagoniſt is, to charge me with blaſphemy upon ſuch ſlight and toyiſh pretenſes as he is pleaſed to take up, and every way ſo weak and inſignificant. I have inſiſted on this longer than was needfull: But I was invited ſo to do, becauſe my Adverſary here ſeems to have intended to make a ſhow of induing his confutations of this ſeventh Chapter with ſo great Triumph; when indeed he has one nothing at all, he having not taken notice of the cloſe of this ſixth Paragraph, that declares and proves, that though there were this natural reference of Images to their Prototypes by reaſon of perſonal ſimilitude of Figure, yet it would be Idolatry to Worſhip them.

Upon the ſeventh Paragraph.

Which I do more fully inculcate in the beginning of the laſt part of this ſeventh Paragraph. And in

in the first and second part thereof copiously demonstrate, that though these Images have the similitude of *Signification* onely, as he loves to call it, and not of *Figure*, yet it is Idolatry over and over again to Worship them. Which Hypothesis he chiefly or rather onely adheres to, and has sported and playd away his time in superfluously and weakly trifling against the first part of my *Dilemma*, is if he would make good the similitude of *Figure* betwixt the Images and *Prototypes* when he seems to believe neither any truth nor necessity of it: but onely to make a show of confuting this seventh Chapter, when he has left the latter end of the sixth Paragraph, and this whole seventh untouched, which is the main drift of all; namely to shew, that whether the Images have any similitude with their Prototypes or no, yet it is Idolatry to Worship them, and that therefore the Council of *Trent* has no subterfuge in this regard to excuse themselves from the charge of Idolatry, in appointing the honour they appoint to them.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Doctrine of the ſecond Council of Nice *touching the Worſhip of Images, (to which the Council of* Trent *refers,) that it is groſly Idolatrous alſo.*

1. BUT now as for the other Reaſon of theſe *Tridentine* Fathers, whereby they would ſupport their Determination in this point, *Viz.* the Authority of the ſecond Council of *Nice* held about the year 780, (to omit, that long before this time the Church had become aſymmetral, which yet is a very ſubſtantial Conſideration) I ſhall only return this brief anſwer. The God of *Iſrael*, which is the Father of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, has given this expreſs command to his Church for ever, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, thou ſhalt not bow down to it, nor worſhip it.* But the ſecond Council of *Nice* ſays, Thou mayſt and ſhalt bow down to to the Image of *Chriſt*, of the bleſſed Virgin, and of the reſt of the Saints. Now whether it be fit to believe and obey God, or men, judg ye: I might add farther, men ſo ſilly and frivolous in the defenſe of their Opinions, ſo falſe and fabulous in the Allegations of their Authorities and the recitall of miraculous Stories, as *Chemnitius* has proved at large in his *Examen* of the Council of *Trent*.

2. I will give an Inſtance or two. Mat. 5. 15. *No man lighteth a candle and putteth it under a buſhell*; therefore the Images of the Saints are to be placed on the Altars, and Wax-candles lighted up before them, in due honour to them. Again, *Pſalm* 16. *But to the Saints that are on the Earth:* But the Saints are in Heaven, ſay they, therefore their Images ought to be on the Earth, &c. As for the Miracles done by Images, as their Speaking, the Healing of the ſick, the Revenging of the wrong done to them, the diſtilling of roriid drops of balſame to heal

heal the wounded, ſick or lame, their Recovering water into a dry Well, and the like, it were too tedious to recite theſe Figments.

But that of the Image of the Virgin, to whom her *Devotioniſt* ſpake when he took leave of her, and was to take a long Journey, intreating her to look to her Candle, which he had lighted up for her, till his return, I cannot conceal. For the Story ſays, the ſame Candle was burning ſix months after, at the return of her *Devoto*. An example of the moſt miraculous Prolonger that ever I met withall before in all my days. Such an Image of the Virgin would ſave poor Students a great deal in the expenſe of Candles, if the thing were but lawfull and feaſible.

3. From theſe ſmall hints a man may eaſily diſcover of what Authority this ſecond Council of *Nice* ought to be, though they had not concluded ſo point-blank againſt the Word of God. But becauſe that Clauſe in this Paragraph of the Council I have recited, *Id quod Conciliorum, præſertim verò ſecundæ Nicænæ Synodi*, &c. may as well aim at the determination of what theſe Fathers *mean* by that *debitus honor & reverentia* which they declare to be due to the Images of *Chriſt* and the Saints, as *confirm* their *own Concluſion* by the Authority of that *Nicene* Council, we will take notice alſo what a kinde of Honour and Reverence to Images the *Nicene* Council did declare for, and in ſhort it is this;

That they are to be worſhipped and adored and to be honoured with Wax-candles, and by the ſmoaking of Incenſe or Perfumes, and the like. Which ſmells rankly enough in all conſcience of Idolatry, as *Grotius* himſelf upon the Decalogue cannot but acknowledge. But this is not all. The Invocation of Saints, their Mediation and propitiating God for us for adoring their Images, healing of Diſeaſes, and other Aids and Helps, beſides *Ora pro nobis*, are manifeſtly involved in the Worſhip of theſe Images, according to that *Nicene* Council.

4. And

4. And truly, according to the Collections of *Photius* in *Justellus*, one would think that they meant the *Cultus Latriæ* to the Image of *Christ*, they using the word διαβαίνειν, as if that Worſhip which was done to the Image paſſed through to *Chriſt* himſelf, which would not be ſutable to him, if itwere not Divine Worſhip. And where that word is not uſed, yet the ſenſe makes hugely for it. As in this Paragraph touching the ſecond Council of *Nice* according to *Photius*; Τὴν γὰ εἰκόνα χρῆσθ ἐπὶ τιμῇ καὶ σεβασμιότητι ἣ εἰκονιζομένῳ προσκυεῖσθαι καὶ τιμᾶσθαι ψήφοις ἀπάσαις ἐπεκύρωσέ τε καὶ ἐπεσφραγίσατο, τῆς προσκυνήσεως καὶ τιμῆς δηλονότι προσαγομένης καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱεροῖς συμβόλοις καὶ τύποις τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἁγιωτάτης λατρείας προσερχόμεθα. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἱστῶμεν καὶ συμπεριλκόμεθα τὴν τιμὴν καὶ προσκύνησιν, ἀδὲ εἰς ἑτερόφυλα καὶ διάφορα τέλη χεῖζόμεθα· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς φαινομένης διαφόρε καὶ μερίδης αὐτῶν θεραπείας καὶ προσκυνήσεως ἱεοπρεπῶς τε καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως εἰς τὴν ἀμέριστον ἐκείνην ἐνοειδῆ τε καὶ ἑνοποιὸν θειότητα ἀναγόμεθα.

This ſeventh Synod, ſaith he, (that is to ſay, the ſecond of *Nice*) *with joint ſuffrages hath eſtabliſhed and ratifi'd the worſhipping of the Image of* Chriſt, *for the honour and reverence of him that is expreſſed by it; this Worſhip and Honour being done in ſuch manner as when we approach the holy Symbols or Types of our moſt holy and Divine Worſhip:* (for the word is λατρεία.) *For we do not ſtop at them, nor reſtrain our Worſhip and Devotion to them, nor are we divided toward heterogeneous and different Scopes or Objects; but by that Service and Worſhip of them that appears divided are we carried up devoutly and undividedly unto the one and indiviſible Deity.* Whereby it is plainly declared, that that very Worſhip which paſſes to the Deity is done towards the Image of *Chriſt* firſt or jointly, as being one and the ſame undivided Worſhip in truth and reality; as alſo that this Worſhip is that

Worſhip

Worſhip which is called *Latria*, and is due to the higheſt God onely.

5. But that Religious Worſhip is done to the Images of all the Saints ſeems imply'd in what comes afterwards, where it is ſaid, that this ſecond Council of *Nice*, (which *Photius* calls ἁγίαν καὶ θεόφορον πανήγυριν,) ὃ μόνον τὴν εἰκόνα χρίστου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τὰς ἱερὰς εἰκόνας, καθ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς τῶν πρωτοτύπων ὑπεροχῆς καὶ σεβασμιότητος, τιμᾶσθαι καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι ἐπιφράγισέ τε καὶ ἐπεκύρωσεν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰς ἔνοπτόν τινα καὶ συναγωγὸν ἀναγόμεθα θεωρίαν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀκρότατον τῶν ὀρεκτῶν δι' αὐτῆς ἀξιούμεθα θείας καὶ ὑπερφυοῦς συναφείας· That this Council *has not onely eſtabliſhed and appointed that the Image of* Chriſt *ſhould be honoured and worſhipped, but the holy Images of the Virgin* Mary *and of all the Saints, according to the excellency and venerability of their Prototypes. For even by theſe are we carried up into a certain unitive and conjunctive viſion, and thereby are vouchſafed that divine and ſupernatural conjunction or contact with the higheſt of all deſirables*, that is, God himſelf.

6. Can any thing more inflame the Souls of men with that myſtical luſt after Idols then the Doctrines of this *Nicene* Synod? For as for the Image of *Chriſt*, the ſame Devotion and Worſhip is done to that which is done to God himſelf. And for the Images of the Virgin *Mary* and the reſt of the Saints, though that Worſhip is allotted them onely that is proportionable to their Prototypes, yet they are worſhipped ſuch a way as that thereby, while we adhere to their Images or Statues, we are declared to be made fit for and to be vouchſafed a tactual Union with God himſelf. What *Philtrum* more effectual to raiſe up that *Idolomania*, that being mad and loveſick after Images and Idols, then this? What can inrage their Affections more towards Idolatry, then to phanſie that while they worſhip Idols, and

and cling about dead Statues, that very individual act (and therefore it cannot be too intense) is that wherewith they are united to, and lie in the very Embraces of, the ever-living and true God?

7. The sense of the Synod is, according to the representation of *Photius*, that we worship and unite our selves with God as well in the worshipping the Images of the Virgin and of other Saints, as in the worshipping of the Image of *Christ*. So that all is *Religious* Worship, and consequently gross Idolatry, it being done to Stocks and Stones and such like senseless Objects. For the drift of all Idolatry is, when it is questioned, and craftily defended, that through the Worship of *Damons* and Images they reach at the Worship of, and the joyning their Devotion to, the first and highest God-head. Wherefore the Council of *Trent* declaring with the second Council of *Nice*, that is to say, the blind leading the blind, they have both fallen into this dreadfull Pit of Idolatry.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Upon the firſt Paragraph.

TO this firſt Paragraph he has given his Anſwer already in what he has ſaid to the firſt Paragraph of the former Chapter, *viz.* Here the Doctor gives us a learned *Antitheſis* between the Commandment of God and Decree of this Council. The like Rhetorical flouriſh he uſes againſt the ſecond Council of *Nice, &c.* See my Reply to his Anſwer on that Paragraph. There is no need of any thing new to be ſaid.

His Anſwer to the ſecond Paragraph.

To that about the weak reaſonings of the Council, which he ſays I would gladly father upon them, he pretends to think it a child of my own brain till I take the pains to prove it is none of mine. Touching the Miracles there mentioned; But whereas, ſaith he, the Council recites ſome Miracles in favour of the due honour given to the Images of Chriſt and his Saints, theſe he moſt profoundly confutes by an unanſwerable laughter. This is the main if not all to this ſecond Paragraph.

The Reply.

To the first I Reply, It is *Chemnitius*, not I, that fathers those subtil reasonings upon the Fathers of the *Nicene* Council. And though I have not had the time nor curiosity to examin the History of the Council my self so throughly and exactly as to affirm of my own notice that this is the very reasoning of the *Nicene* Fathers, yet this I will say for *Chemnitius*, that I find him, so far as I can see, carefull in the main of his account of *things*, not omitting that of the seventh *Action* which my Adversary alledges so triumphantly against *Photius*; Which we shall consider anon. As for that of *Psalm* 16. I am sure they bring it in impertinently enough. But can any thing be more impertinent than that of Pope *Adrian*, who influenced the Council, in his letter to *Irene* and her son *Constantine*, where pleading zealously for Image-Worship he urges these places of Scripture, *Vultum tuum Domine requiram*, Psalm 26. *Ad vultum tuum deprecabuntur omnes divites plebis*, Psalm 44. And again, *Psalm* 4. *Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui*, &c. *Thy face Lord will I seek, Lord lift thou up the light of thy Countenance upon us.* Therefore Images are to be erected and lights set up before them, as if the light of Gods Countenance were to be reflected from these painted Statues, or his face to be sought in looking up to graven Images which his Soul abhors. But such seems to be the arguing of Pope *Adrian* to these two Princes. And as for the middle Quotation, it

is

is very modestly or very cunningly done of the Pope, that he did not take a greater share of that verse, and say, *In muneribus vultum tuum deprecabuntur omnes divites plebis.* But then the plot had been more easily smelt out, that the Zeal for Images was in reference to the Oblations and gifts brought to them. This taste may suffice to let the Reader understand what shrewd Reasoners they were in that Council, when the Pope himself, who inspired all by his influence, reasons at such a rate as he does.

Now to the second part I have nothing to Reply, but that I think it not so commendable carriage for a mans self to laugh when he tells a story that is ridiculous; and therefore it is a breach of Charity, at least of Civility, to affirm that I laughed, where it was not good manners so to do, he not possibly hearing me laugh at such a distance as he was removed from me when I writ this Paragraph; which makes me believe that he himself could not but laugh at the recital of such incredible stuff, and so measured my Corn by his own Bushel.

His Answer to the third Paragraph.

From laughing, saith he, he immediately falls a lowring, and the Reason is, because this Council declares that it is lawfull to burn Candels, Incense, and Perfumes in honour of the Saints before their Images; which he in an angry mood concludes to smell rankly of Idolatry, even by the Authority of Grotius *himself upon the* Decalogue. *This is all in*

Anſwer to this third Paragraph, ſaving his falling foul upon Grotius.

The Reply.

It is not unworthy Obſervation of what a Scenical or Hiſtrionical Genius this *Roman* Doctor my Adverſary is, that can raiſe Comedies and Tragedies thus upon ſuch ſlight occaſions; I muſt confeſs I am ſorry for the Idolatries of their Church, but that I did either laugh before or lowre now is onely the Poetical phancy of my Antagoniſt ſo to imagine. But that the Council of *Nice* does appoint the burning of Incenſe and the lighting of Candles before the Images, I ſhall prove in its proper place. In the mean time I would have my Reader take notice that [even by the Authority of *Grotius* himſelf upon the Decalogue] are the words of my Adverſary not mine, which are theſe, *As* Grotius *himſelf upon the Decalogue cannot but acknowledge.* I give little to the Authority of *Grotius* in himſelf, but to the clearneſs of the Caſe, that ſuch an one that did ſo glaver and fawn upon the Church of *Rome* and endeavour to gratifie her every where to the utmoſt he could, yet was aſhamed to venture to gratifie her in a point ſo clearly againſt her as this, and therefore could not but acknowledge, though againſt his will, that the burning of Incenſe before Images is Idolatry.

His

His Answer to the fourth Paragraph.

Instead of Answering to that Quotation of Photius *which plainly implies that the Council of* Nice *has allotted the Worship of* Latria *to the Image of Christ, he according to his usual Art would make the World believe, that I clash again here with our Church of* England, *out of my own positions or Conclusions. But the thing he here repeats is* Crambe bis cocta, *heartless and sapless stuff, as indeed I proved it to be at first. The sum of his Answer is this, That when the Sons of the Church of* England *bow their knees at the Eucharist, which to them is a Symbolical presence, whether they terminate this act of Worship on the Eucharist or Symbolical presence, or profess it does διαβαίνειν, pass on to Christ, in the first they will be absolute Idolaters by the twentieth Conclusion of my second Chapter, in the second they will be obnoxious to what I urge here against the* Nicene *Council.* One would think they meant the *Cultus Latriæ*, &c. *This, I say, is all he seems to be concerned in upon this Paragraph. For his exception against* Photius *his Authority followes in the next.*

The Reply.

But to this, such as it is, I Answer, or rather say that I have Answered it already upon his first proposing of it; where I deny that we of the Church of *England* take the Bread or Wine to be any

ſymbolical Preſence to be bowed to, but mere ſymbolical Inſtruments of commemorating the Paſſion and Crucifixion of our Saviour, mere holy Elements conſecrated to that uſe. And that we do not kneel to them, or at their approach, but are at our Devotions afore in a poſture of Prayer to God and Chriſt, which theſe Symbols when they are given to us find us aforehand in. So that this is a mere Cavil againſt the Sons of the Church of *England* and againſt my ſelf, deviſed and repeated by my Adverſary to fill up the defect of better Anſwerings.

His Anſwer jointly to the fourth, fifth, and ſixth Paragraphs:

His next pretenſe is to prove poſitively by the Teſtimony of Photius *that this Council gives the worſhip of Latria to the Image of Chriſt. But the Doctor, ſays he, had plaid his Maſter-prize, if he had given all this rabble (he means both the Quotations) in the Councils own words, but inſtead of that he feeds upon Reverſions, at the ſecond hand takes his Quotations from* Photius *(a Perſon of as much credit as himſelf) and makes* Photius *the Paraphraſt and Interpreter of the Councils meaning. But what if the Council ſay no ſuch thing? Nay what if the Council deliver the quite contrary doctrine? How blank then will the Doctors charge look, upon the diſcovery of ſuch Diſingenuity? And truly had the Doctor but taken ſo much as a curſory ſurvey of Catholick Authors on this Subject, he might have*

have found them frequently and truly quoting this very Council, Act. 7. to prove that the Image of Chriſt is not to be honoured with the Worſhip of Latria: but that ſuch honour and reverence is due to Images in general, as to the Books of the Goſpel and the holy utenſils of the Altar. This is all, touching this Chapter, the reſt is raillery and humour, which I leave this Roman *Doctor to enjoy himſelf in. But by the by in the next he pretends that I have omitted the Tranſlation of* κατ' ἀναλογίαν *in my ſecond Quotation of* Photius *in this; which therefore I ſhall touch upon.*

The Reply.

That theſe Quotations out of *Photius* prove that which I produce them for, my Adverſary cannot deny, ſuppoſing the Authority of *Photius* were Authentick; Which he vilifies upon no grounds, nor has any that I know ſo to do. He was the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, the Chief or Head of the Greek Church where this Council was held, And was *Patriarch* not long after this Council. And his place and dignity in the Church, and very Genius you may be ſure would make him very carefull to underſtand a Council of ſo great importance as this: And for his Parts and Learning, he was extraordinarily famous. Concerning which I cannot here abſtain from interſerting that high *Elogium* which that Learned Prelate of our Church Dr. *Creighton* gives him in his Preface to the Hiſtory of the *Florentine* Council. *Illuſtri* Photio *Doctio-*

rem in omni genere literarum, prudentiorem in rebus gerendis, omnis Juris Divini humanique peritiorem nunquam quovis folio vel Romæ *Papam vel* Constantinopoli *Patriarcham sedisse puto.* And again in the same Preface, *Æqualem* Photio *nulla ætas dedit, nulla dabit.* And this *Photius* it is that describes the seven general Councils in his Epistle to *Michael* Prince of *Bulgary*, in none of which, for his own Credit, can a man think he would willingly be taken Tripping, or that he would say any thing contrary to the sense of this Council of *Nice*, which the Bishop of *Rome* had assuredly a Copy of as well as himself, and would have been ready to discover him if he falsified in any thing; especially these two Sees being in Competition for that Principality of *Bulgaria* to whether Church it should be adjoined, they being but lately Converted to Christianity. And therefore in all likelyhood *Photius* would take special heed how he spake any thing contrary to the sense of this Council. Nay, what will you say, if I prove that *Photius* has spoke exquisitely according to the sense of the Pope of *Rome* himself, (I mean of Pope *Adrian* who influenced this Council of *Nice*) as also of the Council it self; who will be blank then? or who ought to blush for his Temerity and Disingenuity?

Let us therefore take notice what Pope *Adrian* says in his letter to *Irene* the Empress and her son *Constantine*. That the Worship or honour done to Images does διαβαίνειν or pass to the *Prototype*

totype, such passages as these in Pope *Adrians* letter do plainly signifie. In the whole Christian World, says he, the holy Images are honoured or worshipped by Believers, *ut per visibilem vultum ad invisibilem Divinitatis Majestatem mens nostra spirituali affectu rapiatur*, which he speaks more especially in respect of the Image of Christ. And a page or two after, *Creatura non terrenam speciem honorat sed cœlestem ipsam figuram reveretur.* And in the page following, *Non enim lignum adoratur sed id quod in ligno conspicitur & memoratur, honorificatur.* And a little above he quotes *Ambrose* to *Gratian* the Emperor, Τί γαρ; μήποτε κὴ τὴν θεότητα κὴ τὴν σάρκα αὐτὸ προσκυνοῦντες μερίζομεν τὸν Χριστόν; ἢ ὅτε αὐτῷ τῷ θείαν εἰκόνα κὴ τὸν χωρὸν προσκυνῶμεν μερίζομεν αὐτόν; μὴ γένοιτο. "What, *says he, out of* Ambrose, when we adore "the Divinity and the flesh of Christ do we di- "vide him? God forbid. And then presently out of *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Constantia* in *Cyprus*, Μὴ γὰ εἰ βασιλεὺς ἔχει εἰκόνα δύο εἰσὶ βασιλεῖς; ὁ μυ- οῦ. ὁ βασιλεὺς εἷς ἐστι κὴ μετὰ τῆς εἰκόνος, *i. e.* "If a King have his Statue or Image, is he pre- "sently two Kings? no by no means: The King "is still one together with his Image. And now we have heard Pope *Adrian* Patriarch of *Rome*, let us hear what *Tarrhasius* Patriarch or Pope of *Constantinople* speaks, who presided in this *Nicene* Council, and does fully and plainly agree to this letter of *Adrian* writ to *Irene* and the Emperor her son, he and the whole Synod professing, that they ought *to receive Images*,

κὴ

καὶ πάντας ὡσαύτως πόθῳ προσκυνεῖν εἰς ὄνομα Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, &c. "and the said Images made to Christ who "is God, to our immaculate Lady the holy Mo-"ther of God, to the holy Angels and Saints to "adore and Worship them with respective affecti-"on, in the mean time plainly directing or de-"voting their faith and Latria to the onely one "true God, πρόδηλον εἰς ἕνα μόνον θεὸν ἀληθινὸν τὴν λατρείαν καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀναπεμπούσας.

All which Quorations considered together plainly intimate what *Photius* has declared in that which I have produced of him. That there is a διάβασις of that Worship which is done to Images, and that it passes to the *Prototype*; which therefore must be such as is worthy the Prototype, and therefore *Latria* in the Image of Christ. This Diabasis or passing of the Worship to the Prototype is so manifestly and so principally aimed at, that in some of these sentences I have recited, they deny any honour at all done to the Image, declaring that the Terrestrial form is not honoured but the Celestial, nor the wooden Image, but that which is signified by it; and yet that the Image and Person is one, to make sure of but one Mode of Worship which is due to the Person or Prototype, and that there is no dividing of the Worship more than of the Person: which is exactly according to *Photius* his description of this Council, Paragraph 4. "Nor are we divided toward heterogene-"ous and different scopes and Objects, but by that "service and Worship of them that appear divided "are we carried up devoutly and undividedly un-

"to

"to the one and indivisible Deity, to the onely one true God, as the Council and *Tarrhasius* concludes in this 2. Act. Compare with this also the latter Clause of the Quotation out of *Photius* in the fifth Paragraph. So that hitherto *Photius* has exquisitely represented the mind of the Council.

Let us now hear what is said Act. 7. to which my Antagonist appeals. The last definitive sentence therefore of the Council as much as respects our business is this. Ὁρίζομεν σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ πάσῃ καὶ ἐπιμελείᾳ ἀνατίθεσθαι τὰς σεπτὰς καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας, καὶ πάντοις ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν· ἃ μὴν τὴν, κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν, ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν ἡ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις εὐαγγελίοις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασι· καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ φώτων προσαγωγὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καθὼς καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις εὐσεβῶς εἴθιστο. Ἡ γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει, καὶ ὁ προσκυνῶν τὴν εἰκόνα προσκυνεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦ ἐγγραφομένου ὑπόστασιν. that is, "We "define with all care and earnestness that holy "and adorable Images be set up, and that they "be honoured with salutations and adorations, "but not in such sort as according to the te- "nour of our Faith is the true Latria which be- "longs onely to the Divine Nature; but in such "sort as we salute and Worship the Figure of the "pretious and vivificative Cross, the sacred Books "of the Gospel and other holy Things. And that "there be added also Lights and Incense for the "honouring of them, as was the Pious custom of "the

"the ancients. For the honour of the Image passes to "the *Prototype*, and he that worships the Image wor- "ships the person which the Image doth express.

This is in full as much as respects the point in hand out of Act. 7. of this *Nicene* Council according to the Greek Text as *Severinus Binius* has set it out: And the word διαβαίνειν is plainly used here. According to which and to those passages in Pope *Adrians* letter, and the Consent thereto of *Tarrhasius* and the whole Council, Act 2. it is manifest that *Photius* has given an account of this Council, terminating no Worship in the Images nor any thing used in our Religion, but onely in God himself, or in the Saints, or rather not in the Saints neither, but εἰς ἕνα μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, as both the Council and *Photius* faithfully following the foot-steps of the Council do declare. But now in this last definition of the Council, to say they give to no Image that Worship which is *Latria*, and then afterwards to say, The Worship done to the Image does διαβαίνειν *pass* to the *Prototype*, is plainly to say they give Worship not Divine to Christ, and so declare he is not God; which makes me hugely suspect, that ὃ μὲν τὴν, κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν, ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν till we come to ἀλλ' has been foisted in since *Photius* his time. But *Photius* living not long after the Council, perused uncorrupted copies thereof; And truely that this is foisted in it is an argument to me, in that the sense seems so lame and bungling, as if the party knew not how to express his mind in the language. For it should be naturally, either ὃ μὲν, περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡμῶν, τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, &c. *Not giving them, contrary*

contrary to the tenour of our faith, the true Latria which belongs onely to God, or else, ἢ μὴ τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν ἣ κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν, &c. *Not giving them the true Latria, which according to the tenour of our faith belongs onely to God.* For the definition of what is the true *Latria* is not so properly any Article of our Faith and Religion, but that the true *Latria* belongs to God alone.

And therefore the first reading was in all likelyhood thus; *That holy and adorable Images be set up, and that they be honoured with salutations and adorations in such sort as we salute and Worship the figure of the blessed and vivificative Cross, the sacred Books of the Gospel, and other holy Things. And that there be added also Lights and Incense*, &c. *For the honour of the Image passes to the Prototype*; where we might take notice of the unskilfull blunder and gross confusion in the Latine Translation which is caused by not taking notice, that [*we define*] is to be repeated ὅπερ καινίζω, before [And that there be added also Lights and Incense, *&c.*] But one thing more especially is to be observed here, That the Council does look at the burning of Incense and setting up Lights as an Act of *Latria* if before the Image of Christ, and as a Religious Worship be they before what Image they will, for immediately after [*And that there be added also Lights and Incense*, &c.] there follows, *For the Honour done to the Image passeth to the Prototype.*

But I will add unto all this, that suppose the foisted words which we have excluded should be retained and allowed of, yet if we improve that Epithet of *Latria* to what it seems to aim at, it will not at all justle with *Photius* his sense nor other parts of the Council. For ἀληθινὴ λατρεία *true Latria*

Latria, here naturally ſignifies that Latria which is *Terminative* on the Object, which can belong to no other but God. And therefore is counter-diſtinct to that *Latria* which does διαβαίνειν and is *Tranſitive*, which cannnot belong to God, becauſe there is none greater nor higher than He to whom it ſhould paſs: whence it is plain that the *Tranſitive Latria* is not the *true Latria* as being incompetible to God the higheſt Object. So that *Cultus Latriæ tranſitivus* or *reſpectivus*, that is, which hits ſo on one Object, that it tends to an higher and better, is allowed by the Council to the Image of Chriſt, though not *Cultus Latriæ terminativus*. Which *Binius* alſo plainly acknowledges in his Notes on this ſeventh Act of the Council. Which is the very ſenſe of *Photius*; And which this foiſted ſentence at leaſt does not obſcure, but doth rather imply, That this to the Image of Chriſt is *Latria* too, but not *vera Latria*, viz. *Terminative* but *Tranſitive* onely; which is the Thing, as I ſaid, which *Photius* aſſerts.

And now for that paſſage in the ſecond Quotation καὶ ἀναλογίαν τῆς τῶν πρωτοτύπων ὑπεροχῆς, the genuine ſenſe of it will be hence eaſily underſtood. For *Latria* belonging to the Image of Chriſt according to the ſenſe of the Council and of *Photius*, and to Chriſt himſelf according to the ſenſe of all Orthodox Chriſtians, the Analogy will be thus. Let Chriſt himſelf be 24. and the Worſhip due to him, *viz.* Latria, 18. Let the Virgin *Mary* be 8. every Saint elſe 4. Now καὶ ἀναλογίαν τῶν πρωτοτύπων we neceſſarily conclude,

as

as 24 to 8, ſo 18 to 6. As 24 to 4, ſo 18 to 3, that is to ſay, As Chriſt is to *Mary*, ſo is *Latria* to *Hyperdulia*, and as Chriſt is to any other Saint, ſo is *Latria* to *Dulia*. But according to the Council and *Photius* who give *Latria* alſo to the Image of Chriſt; Then as Chriſt is to *Mary*, ſo is the Worſhip of the Image of Chriſt which is *Latria*, to the Worſhip of the Image of *Mary*, which muſt therefore be *Hyperdulia*. And as Chriſt or *Mary* to another Saint, ſo the Worſhip of the Image of Chriſt or *Mary* to the Worſhip of the Image of another Saint. The former therefore being *Latria* and *Hyperdulia*, this laſt muſt be *Dulia*: The Worſhip of the Image of the Saint muſt be *Dulia*, as well as of its Prototype: Which is the very ſame that *Alexander Halis*, *Thomas Aquinas* and *Bonaventure* thoſe ancient School-men, who writ above 400 years ago, do affirm, That the ſame honour is done to the Image that is done to the Prototype. That the Images have *according to the excellency and venerability of their Prototypes*, ſome *Latria*, ſome *Hyperdulia*, and ſome *Dulia*. And thus I think I have proved my Tranſlation of that paſſage, κατ' ἀναλογίαν, *&c.* to be very right and full, which he ſays is the onely material word in that Citation, *pag.* 86. *l.* 13. and have made it manifeſt, that the very Analogy *Photius* aimes at concludes the ſameneſs of honour to *Image* and *Prototype*. And which is my main drift of all, I have ſufficiently evinced that *Photius* has given the moſt natural and genuine ſenſe of this *Nicene* Council. According to which my Adverſary

even

even in his own conceit and opinion cannot but conclude the Church of *Rome*, which refers her ſelf to this Council, to be groſs Idolaters. And who, I pray you, ought to be blank now?

Upon the ſeventh Paragraph.

That my Antagoniſt Anſwers nothing to this ſeventh and laſt Paragraphs, muſt be either becauſe he thinks he has Anſwered it already by denying that ſenſe of the Council which *Photius* repreſents, or becauſe he thinks it unanſwerable. If the former, I have made good that *Photius* his ſenſe of the Council is the moſt genuine and natural. If the latter, we have the day in this Point without any more to do.

Nor can I imagine what may occur that may ſeem at all to leſſen the certainty of that ſenſe of *Photius*, unleſs that paſſage of *Conſtantine* Biſhop of *Conſtantia*, Act 4. where giving his vote for the worſhipping of Images (as if forſooth there was any fear that he ſhould give that Worſhip to the Image of a Saint that is due to the holy Trinity) he is made to reſerve τῷ κατὰ λατρείαν προσκυνήσιν (by which is underſtood ἡ προσκυνήσις ἡ καλυμμένη λατρεία) τῇ ὑπερουσίῳ καὶ ζωαρχικῇ τριάδι, *to the ſuper-eſſential and zoarchical Trinity*. The former part of which is ſo without analogy, and the latter ſo turgid and preterſcriptural, and this caution ſo ſolitary, not one of the Biſhops making any ſuch caution but himſelf; and laſtly, ſo ſuperfluous in reſpect of what goes before in the form of profeſſion

fession approved by them, (Where they declare they do not Worship τῷ ὕλῳ καὶ τὰ χρώματα, the *painted wood or stone*, but that through these by the eyes of their mind they are carried to the *Prototypes*, according to that of *Basil* the great, ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει; which is a sign they pretend not one Worship for the Image and another for the Prototype, but that it is one Worship though the Image to the Prototype,) that I must confess to me it makes Bishop *Constantines* Caution look very odly and unlikely to be his own, but of some heedless and unskilfull foister in of stuff to serve a sense against the general current of the Council, or to obscure the genuine tenour of it. Which yet, if λατρεία be understood of the ἀληθινὴ λατρεία, as I have noted and explained it above, though this caution were in, it would not be repugnant to any part of the Council. And besides, what is the Authority of one single Bishop in so great a number of Bishops, to weaken the general Current of the sense of the Council? So sure and certain every way is the meaning that *Photius* has represented of the Council.

CHAP. IX.

The meaning of the Doctrine of the Council of Trent *touching the Worſhip of Images more determinately illuſtrated from the general Practice of the* Roman *Church and Suffrage of their Popes, whereby it is deprehended to be ſtill more courſly and Paganically Idolatrous.*

1. BUT it may be it may give more ſatisfaction to ſome, to know what is the Church of *Rome's* own ſenſe of this *Honor debitus* ſhe declares ought to be done to the Images of *Chriſt* and the Saints. Putting off a man's Hat, and lying proſtrate before them, the Council does not ſtick to inſtance in by the bye. But becauſe the Council calls this neither *Dulia*, nor *Hyperdulia*, nor *Latria*, ſome will, it may be, be ready to ſhuffle it off with the interpretation of but a *civil* Complement to theſe Images or their Prototypes.

But ſince the Council of *Trent* has declared nothing farther, what can be a more certain Interpreter of their meaning then the continued Cuſtome of their Church, and the ſenſe of ſuch Doctours as have been even ſainted for their Eminency, as *Thomas Aquinas* and *Bonaventure*, who both of them have declared that the Image of *Chriſt* is to be worſhipped with the Worſhip of *Latria*, the ſame that *Chriſt* is worſhipped with?

2. And *Azorius* the *Jeſuite* affirms that it is the conſtant Opinion of the Theologers, (their own, he means, you may be ſure,) that the Image is to be honoured and worſhipped with the ſame Honour and Worſhip that he is whoſe Image it is. Which is not unlike that in the Council of *Nice*,, καὶ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς τῶν προτύπων ὑπαρχῆς, in the foregoing Citation. But that they are all capable of religious

ligious Worſhip, the Council of *Trent* it ſelf (as well as *Bellarmine* and others, if not all the Theologers of that Church,) does plainly acknowledge, in that it determines for their Invocation, which is competible to no inviſible Power but the Godhead it ſelf. Wherefore it is manifeſt that their Images are worſhipped with *religious* Worſhip alſo.

3. But we ſhall make ſtill the clearer judgement thereof, if we conſider the Conſecration of theſe Images which the Council of *Trent* declares are to be worſhipped. For the Conſecration and Worſhipping of them makes them perfectly as the Idol-Gods of the Heathen, as *Octavius* jearingly ſpeaks of the Heathen Gods, that is, their Idols, in *Minucius Felix*: *Ecce funditur, fabricatur, ſcalpitur; nondum Deus eſt. Ecce plumbatur, conſtruitur, erigitur; nec adhuc Deus eſt. Ecce ornatur, conſecratur, oratur; tunc poſtremò Deus eſt.* Behold it is clothed or adorned, it is conſecrated and prayed unto; then at length it becomes a God. And if this will doe it, the Church of *Rome*'s Images will prove as good Idol-Gods as any of them all.

4. *Chemnitius* recites ſome forms of Conſecration: I will cull out onely thoſe of the Images of the bleſſed Virgin and of S. *John*. That of the Virgin is this: *anctify, O God, this Image of the bleſſed Virgin, that it may aid and keep ſafe thy faithfull people; that Thundrings and Lightnings, if they grow too terrible and dangerous, may be quickly expelled thereby; and that the Inundations of Rain, the Commotions of civil War, and Devaſtations by Pagans, may be ſuppreſſed by the preſence thereof.* Which is moſt effectual to make all men come and hurcle under the protection of the Virgin's Image in ſuch dangers, as under the Wings of the great *Jehovah*. This is hugely like the conſecrated Teleſms of the Pagans.

But let us hear the form of the Conſecration of the Image of S. *John* alſo: *Grant, O God, that all thoſe that behold this Image with Reverence, and pray before it, may*

be he ard in whatſoever Streights they are. Let this Image be the holy Expulſion of Devils, the conciliating the preſence and aſſiſtence of Angels, the protection of the faithfull; and that the Interceſſion of this Saint may be very powerfull and effectuall in this place. What a mighty Charm is this to make the Souls of the feeble to hang about theſe Images as if their Preſence were the Divine Protection it ſelf?

5. Theſe *Chemnitius* recites out of the *Pontifical* he peruſed. But the *Rituale Romanum*, publiſhed firſt by the command of *Paulus Quintus*, and again authorized by Pope *Urban* the eighth, will do our buſineſs ſufficiently, they being both ſince the Council of *Trent*; and therefore by the Expoſition of theſe Popes we may know what that *debitus Honor* is which the *Tridentine* Fathers mention as that which ought to be done to the Images of *Chriſt*, the bleſſed Virgin or any other Saint. For the Conſecration of their Images runs thus:

Grant, O God, that whoſoever before this Image ſhall diligently and humbly upon his knees worſhip and honour thy only begotten Son, or the bleſſed Virgin, (according as the Image is that is a-conſecrating) *or this glorious Apoſtle, or Martyr, or Confeſſor, or Virgin, that he may obtain by his or her Merits and interceſſion Grace in this preſent life and eternall Glory hereafter.*

So that the Virgin and other Saints are fellow-diſtributers of Grace and Glory with *Chriſt* himſelf to their Supplicants before their Images, and that upon their own Merits, and for this Service done to them in kneeling and pouring out their Prayers before their Statues or ſymbolicall Preſences. What greater Blaſphemy and Idolatry can be imagined? *Ornatur, conſecratur, oratur, tunc poſtremò fit Deus:* that is to ſay, The Image is pray'd before, but the *Daemon* pray'd unto. There is no more in Paganiſm it ſelf. And yet by the Pope's own Expoſition this is the *debitus Honor* that is owing to the Images of the Saints. Conſider the latter end of the laſt Concluſion of the firſt Chapter,

Chapter, and the forms of Invocation in the fourth and fifth, as alſo the eighteenth Concluſion of the ſecond Chapter.

6. This is all plain and expreſs according to the Authority of their Church. And that, beſides their Adoration and Praying before theſe Images, (which, conſidering the poſtures of the Supplicant and the Image, is as much praying to them as the Heathens will acknowledge done to theirs,) there are alſo Wax-candles burning before them, and the Oblation of Incenſe or perfuming them, Feaſts likewiſe, Temples and Altars to the ſame Saints, and the carrying them in Proceſſion, (which was the guize of ancient Paganiſm,) is ſo well known, that I need not quote any Authours. And that this is the practice of the *Roman* Church jointly and coherently with their Worſhip of Images, is manifeſt to all the world; and that therefore it is as arrant Idolatry as Paganiſm it ſelf, and conſequently real Idolatry by the third Concluſion of the firſt Chapter. And laſtly, it is to be noted that the Council of *Trent*, naming the *debitus Honor* of Images, and not excepting theſe in known practice then among them, muſt of all reaſon be conceived to mean theſe very Circumſtances, as Paganicall as they are, of the Worſhipping of them.

7. And the rather, becauſe they do pretend to reſtify ſome Miſcarriages in the buſineſs of Images, as any unlawfull or diſhoneſt Gain by them, all laſcivious Dreſſes of the Images, all Drunkenneſs and diſorderly Riot at their Feaſts, and the like. Which methinks is done with as grave caution againſt Idolatry, as if they had decreed that all the Whores in *Rome* ſhould forbear to go in ſo gariſh apparell, that they ſhould be ſure to wear clean linen, to be favourable to poor younger Brothers in the price of a night's Lodging, that they keep themſelves wholſome and clean from the Pox, and the like; which were not the putting down, but the eſtabliſhing, of whores and Whoredome in the Papacy. And ſo are

theſe Cautions touching Images. *Exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis.* Wherefore theſe Circumſtances of Idolatry being not named by the *Tridentine* Fathers in their Exception, they are thereby ratify'd. Which yet are ſo like the old Pagan Idolatry, that *Ludovicus Vives*, one of their own Church, could not abſtain from profeſſing, *non poſſe aliquid diſcrimen oſtendi, niſi quòd nomina tantùm & titulos mutaverint*; That onely the Names and Objects were changed, not the Modes, of the ancient Idolatry of the Heathen.

8. If the Council of *Trent* would have really and in good earneſt rectify'd their Church in the point of Images, they ſhould have followed the Example of that skilfull and famous Phyſician Dr. *Butler*, they ſhould have imitated his Preſcript touching the ſafe eating of a Pear, *viz.* That we ſhould firſt pare it very carefully, and then be ſure to cut out or ſcoup out all the Coar of it, and after that fill the hollow with Salt, and when this is done, caſt it forthwith into the Kennell. This is the ſafeſt way of dealing with thoſe things that have any intrinſick Poiſon or Danger in them. See thoſe moſt wholeſome and judicious Homilies of our Church of *England* againſt the Perill of Idolatry.

9. And thus much ſhall ſerve for the ſetting out the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* ſo far as it ſeems to be allow'd by the Church it ſelf. But for thoſe more groſs Extravagancies, which, though they have connived at, yet they would be loath to own upon publick Authority, I will neither weary my ſelf nor my Reader by meddling with them. Such as the making the Images to ſweat, their Eyes to move, the making them to ſmile, or lowre and look ſad, to feel heavy or light, or the like. Which does neceſſarily tend to the engaging of the people to believe and have affiance in the very Images themſelves, as thoſe Conſecrations alſo imply which I cited out of *Chemnitius*, and which that Rhyme ſeems to acknow-

acknowledge which they ſay to that Face of *Chriſt* which they call the *Veronica*. Which Rhyme runs thus:

Nos perduc ad patriam, felix ô Figura,
Ad videndam Faciem quæ eſt Chriſti *pura.*
Nos ab omni macula purga Vitiorum,
Et tandem conſortio junge Beatorum.

And with ſuch like blinde Devotion do they likewiſe ſpeak to the Croſs:

O Crux, ſpes unica,
Hoc Paſſionis tempore
Auge piis Juſtitiam,
Reiſque dona Veniam.

This muſt ſound very wildly and extravagantly to any ſenſible ear. And yet the invoking any Saint before his Image for Aid and Succour, (the Image bearing the name and repreſentation of the Saint,) with Eyes and Hands lift up to it, is as arrant talking with a ſenſleſs Stock or a Stone as this, and as groſs a piece of Idolatry, though approved of by the Authority of the *Roman* Church. But I intended to break off before.

See Ch. 1. Conclu. 10.

CHAP. IX.

His Answer to the first Paragraph.

That the Image of Christ, says he, may be worshipped with the Worship of Latria (though expresly contrary to the Doctrine of the second Council of Nice) *is the commonly supposed Opinion of St.* Thomas *and St.* Bonaventure. *But there is a great difference betwixt,* is to *be worshipped, and* may be *worshipped. And besides it is hard to say, what the meaning of these two Doctors is, they wind about so, and enter into such nice distinctions,* &c.

The Reply.

AS to the being contrary to the Council of *Nice*, I Reply, That I have already shown that it is most consonant thereto, both from *Photius* and the Council it self. And therefore *Thomas* and *Bonaventure* being such very ancient Schoolmen, about 400 years ago, and therefore much nearer to the *Nicene* Council, it is most likely they followed the air of that Council and of Pope *Adrians* letter to *Irene* and *Constantine* approved by that Council. And it is incredible that Pope *Adrians* letter and the sense of the Council concerning so great a point, and of so high importance, should be unknown to the Church of *Rome*, especially the more

more learned of them, for above four hundered years together. Touching [*May be* worshipped] and [*Is to* be worshipped] I demand whether any undue VVorship may be given to the Image of Christ. If therefore that VVorship which may be given is due and fit, it is plain it is to be given or ought to be given; which questionless was the Opinion of both *Thomas* and *Bonaventure*. And lastly, As to the winding into nice distinctions, what distinctions are here but onely of *Terminativè*, and *Relativè*, or *Transitivè?* which are intelligible enough, *viz.* That *Latria* cannot be given to the Image of Christ *Terminativè*, but onely *Relativè*, or *Transitivè*. It must διαβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον, pass to the Prototype as the Council of *Nice* speaks. That is to say, We must do Divine honour to the Image of Christ that Christ ultimately may be honoured thereby, which is plainly to commit gross Idolatry to the glory and honour of Christ. And therefore my Adversary durst name none of these nice distinctions, not because they are above the capacity of the Vulgar, but because even a Vulgar capacity can easily observe the folly and futility of them.

His Answer to the second Paragraph.

First, he says, That my alledging of Azorius *is a proofless Accusation or Calumny against them. I suppose, because I cite not the very place and words. Secondly, Touching the Doctrine* Azorius *witnesses of, he says it is so far from being the constant Opinion of their Theologers,*

Theologers, that it is now generally rejected by them, unleſs limited by that qualifying diſtinction of κατ' ἀναλογίαν; *which he ſays I have forgot or purpoſely omitted in my long Tranſlation out of* Photius, *though the onely material word in the whole citation. For he contends that the Worſhip due to the Image and the Prototype, is* Analogically *though not* Univocally *the ſame; which he would have intimated in that paſſage of* Photius, κατ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς τῶν πρωτοτύπων ὑπεροχῆς, *and that therefore I have purpoſely omitted the Tranſlation of it. He ſtreams out a great deal further in this ſecond part of his Anſwer to this Paragraph, but what ever is material I ſhall have an eye to in my Reply.*

The Reply.

To that of *Azorius*, I have no more to ſay than thus, to prove it no Calumny; That his words *Inſtit. Moral. part* 1. *lib.* 9. *cap.* 6 are theſe, *Conſtans eſt Theologorum ſententia imaginem eodem honore & cultu honorari & coli quo colitur id cujus eſt Imago.* What can be more expreſs? Touching the doctrine it ſelf, I note from the very intimatition of my Adverſary, that he cannot well deny, but that it has been the general doctrine of their Church though now it is not, they being Apoſtates, as it ſeems, from the Opinion of Pope *Adrian*, the ſteerſ-man of that Council of *Nice*, whom yet they now make a Fallible Mortal, renouncing his Opinion and the Councils, as I think I have plainly proved above. And then to what he ſays,

says, Unless limited by that qualifying distinction of κατ' ἀναλογίαν, which I purposely omitted in Translating of *Photius*. First, I say, I did not omit the Translating of it; For I render κατ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς τῶν ἀντιτύπων ὑπεροχῆς, thus, *According to the excellency of the Prototypes*, [according] here being the same that *pro ratione*, and that the same that κατ' ἀναλογίαν. But, not onely notwithstanding this passage, but from this very passage have I demonstrated, according to the mind of *Photius* and the Council, that one and the same Worship, even univocally the same, is to be given to the Image and the Prototype. Of such confessed Idolatry has their Church been found guilty of till of late, even according to my Adversaries Concession.

But now, Secondly, with my Adversary to say, They are onely Analogically the same, is a phrase of uncertain signification, whether it is to be understood *Logically* or *Geometrically*. If *Logically*, it is as much as to say, That the Worship to the Image and the Prototype agree in one immediate *Genus Analogum*. As in those words that I suspected foisted into the Council, there is mention of ἀληθινὴ λατρεία, by which suppose were meant the highest and most principal *Latria*, which is excepted there as undue, suppose to the Image of Christ; but that there may be some other *Latria* that is. Wherefore the *Genus Analogum* that is immediate to these two *Latria's*, is a *Latria* common to them both, and the two *Latriæ* under it, the one to Christ, the other to his Image, are the *species* of this *Genus*.

Genus. And ſo in like manner of *Hyperdulia* to the bleſſed Virgin and of *Dulia* to the reſt of the Saints, theſe words uſed in reſpect of their Images and of themſelves muſt be the *ſpecies* of thoſe common *genera*, *Hyperdulia* and *Dulia*. But according to the Rudiments of *Logick* the *ſpecies* of a *Genus Analogum* do really, though one dependently of the other and leſs principally, partake of the common nature of the *Genus*; which being either *Latria*, *Hyperdulia*, or *Dulia*, and all theſe Religious Worſhip, it is manifeſt Religious Worſhip is given to all the Images.

But now if we underſtand that the Worſhip done to the Image and the Prototype is Analogically the ſame in a *Geometrical* ſenſe, we are firſt to take notice, that Analogy in Geometry requires four termes; as, in A, B :: B, C. or A, B :: C, D. And therefore the four Termes in this Caſe, will be, Chriſt, the Worſhip of Chriſt, Chriſts Image, the Worſhip of Chriſts Image: As Chriſt to the Worſhip of Chriſt, ſo Chriſts Image to the Worſhip of Chriſts Image. Now if you will ſay, The Worſhip of Chriſt and the Worſhip of Chriſts Image is one and the ſame Term in this Analogy, you *ipſo facto* declare, that, ſeeing the Worſhip of Chriſt is *Latria* properly ſo called, the Worſhip of Chriſts Image is ſo alſo. You ſee therefore how groſs a thing it is to ſay the Termes are Analogically the ſame in this Geometrical way, it implying alſo a Parity betwixt the Image of Chriſt and Chriſt himſelf. And the ſame inconvenience will recur though you take

take them alternately: As Chriſt to Chriſts Image, ſo the Worſhip of Chriſt to the Worſhip of Chriſts Image. Here again if the VVorſhip of Chriſts Image and the VVorſhip of Chriſt be the ſame, it will follow that there is a Parity betwixt Chriſt and his Image, which is Impoſſible. But you will ſay, the Worſhip of Chriſt, and the Worſhip of Chriſts Image is Analogically the ſame, That's the thing you mean. But you ſeem not to know what you mean your ſelves: If you mean in that Logical ſenſe above, you have your Anſwer already; If you mean in a Geometrical or Arithmetical ſenſe, if I ſhould uſe your freedom of ſpeech elſewhere, I might ſay more than that it is not ſenſe. For the Termes including a proportion are not called Analogically the ſame, but the proportions included betwixt each two Termes, which make up the four Termes proportional, are rightly ſaid to be the ſame; As in 6 to 3, and 4 to 2, the proportion betwixt 6 and 3 is the ſame proportion that betwixt 4 and 2; but neither 6 and 3 nor 4 and 2 are Analogically the ſame. Therefore nothing with any ſenſe can be ſaid this Geometrical way unleſs this, That there is the ſame proportion betwixt the VVorſhip of Chriſt and the VVorſhip of his Image, that there is betwixt Chriſt and Chriſts Image. But this is far from ſaying the VVorſhip of Chriſt and the VVorſhip of his Image is Analogically the ſame; there being no ſameneſs of Termes including proportions in theſe Caſes, unleſs the Termes be equal, as in 10, 10 :: 5, 5. or 10, 5 :: 10, 5.

But

But thus will the Image of Christ have *Latria* due to it as well as Christ himself. But such muddy and confounded Doctrines must needs be the mothers of confounded Notions and distinctions. But supposing, As Christ to his Image (which must be the ground of proportion betwixt the two Worships of Christ and Christs Image) so the Worship of Christ is to the Worship of Christs Image; the Image of Christ being in a most absolute sense infinitely inferiour to Christ himself, what kind or share of Worship that is to terminate on his Image, can be imagined so mean, but it will be really too much? and therefore the fittest proportion will be none at all. And how will lighting up Candles and burning Incense before Christs Image, which is plainly Religious Worship, yea Sacrifice and therefore *Latria*, as I have proved above, and yet enjoyned by this Council of *Nice*, bear so little proportion to the Worship of Christ himself, as his Image does to him, which is infinitely inferiour?

Things therefore succeed so ill this *Arithmetical* way that I half phancy my Antagonist to affect the *Logical*, though I must confess I know not which he would be at, he is so off and on; which made me show the unsuccessfulness of both. But let the Reader judge of his words, *pag.* 87. *As the Man and the painted Man are Analogically the same, so the honour done to the painted Man and the Man himself, are not univocally but Analogically the same*; which he applies to Images and Prototypes. By saying not Univocally but Analogically the same,

same, (though a few lines before he expresses himself in a Geometrical way) he seems to make a Man and a painted Man two *species* under one *Genus Analogum*, whenas a Man and a painted Man are termes equivocal; As if *Thomas* and *Bonaventure* when they declared the Worship given to the Image and the Prototype to be the same, meant equivocally the same! What is all this but Tergiversation and Equivocation? No question therefore but *Thomas* and *Bonaventure* meant as *Photius*, and *Photius* as the *Nicene* Council, and the *Nicene* Council as Pope *Adrian*. And that Religious Worship is meant to Images in their worshipping them, is plain from that Clause; Καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ φώτων προσαγωγὴν πρὸς τὴν τούτων τιμὴν πεποιῆσθαι. Ἡ γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει. *That besides Salutation and Adoration, they were to add the setting up Lights and burning of Incense in honour to them. For the honour done to the Image passes to the Prototype.* Now as I above noted, burning of Incense is a Sacrifice, and setting up Lights was a piece of Religious service in the Pagan Religion to their *Dæmons* and a kind of Oblation, and it is here plainly expressed to be done in honour to the Images, out of all which it is apparent that it is Religious Worship. And then, in that it is said διαβαίνειν, to pass to the Prototype, that is a further Confirmation thereof, and intimation that it is that very Worship that is competible to the Prototype; whether Christ, the blessed Virgin, or any other Saint, to all whom *Invocation* is expressly competible

ble according to the Council of *Trent* it ſelf; which yet is competible to no inviſible Power, but the very Godhead. But Pope *Adrian* in his Letter to *Irene* and *Conſtantine* ſays expreſly, that Images and their Prototypes are lookt upon but as one, and therefore their VVorſhip but as one; not one to the Image the other to the Prototype, (accordingly as *Photius* hath faithfully declared the ſenſe of the Council) but one Religious Worſhip paſſing through the Image to the Prototype: As thoſe that ſhould VVorſhip the Moon through a glaſs window with the picture of the Moon in it. I do not at all doubt but this was the genuine and true ſenſe and air of that ſecond Council of *Nice*.

And therefore my Antagoniſt muſt give me leave to give credit to *Azorius*, (who, by the by, does alſo declare, that it is the ſenſe alſo of the Council of *Nice* and of *Trent*) when he tells us this is the conſtant Opinion of their Theologers, eſpecially the more ancient Schoolmen, as *Alexander Hales*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, &c. as keeping to the right ſenſe of Pope *Adrian* and this ſeventh general Council called on purpoſe to decide this matter of Images. And if you have changed of late from this Rule, it is but a conceſſion how groſly you were lapſed into Idolatry before. Nor are you yet a jot mended, by ſaying it is Analogically the ſame VVorſhip, it ſtill remaining Religious VVorſhip terminated in the Images themſelves; which is a groſs blot, and makes the matter worſe than before. But to make

make the Worſhip equivocally the ſame, is ſuch an equivocating quibble to put on theſe two Saints of *Rome*, St. *Thomas*, and St. *Bonaventure*, that all the honour done to their Images will not recompenſe this injury done to their Memorie.

And thus I have uſed my Chriſtian liberty, which my Adverſary ſo courteouſly allowes me, in impugning *Gabriel Biel*, and whoſoever elſe do corrupt the genuine ſenſe of *Thomas Aquinas*, and *Bonaventure*, with ſuch pittifull gloſſes. And whereas he ſays the Council of *Trent* never mentions any ſuch Worſhip of *Latria* due to the Image of Chriſt; I Anſwer, it mentions the Council of *Nice*, and refers to the ſentence of that Council, which aſſuredly was the ſame that *Azorius* ſays is the conſtant Tenet of Theologers. And thus conſequentially at leaſt does the Council of *Trent* declare for *Latria* to the Image of Chriſt. Beſides, as I have noted; *Azorius* is of Opinion that the Council of *Trent* of it ſelf is of this judgement. But of this enough, Nor has he any thing elſe on this ſecond Paragraph which may not eaſily be Anſwered from what is ſaid already.

His Anſwer to the third Paragraph.

Here is a Calumny, ſaith he, of the firſt Magnitude, moſt uncharitably implying that the Roman *Church prayes to Images as the Heathen did to their Idol-Gods. The charge is ſo groſs that no Perſon but one remove from a fool can*

ble according to the Council of *Trent* it self; which yet is competible to no invisible Power, but the very Godhead. But Pope *Adrian* in his Letter to *Irene* and *Constantine* says expresly, that Images and their Prototypes are lookt upon but as one, and therefore their VVorship but as one; not one to the Image the other to the Prototype, (accordingly as *Photius* hath faithfully declared the sense of the Council) but one Religious Worship passing through the Image to the Prototype: As those that should VVorship the Moon through a glass window with the picture of the Moon in it. I do not at all doubt but this was the genuine and true sense and air of that second Council of *Nice*.

And therefore my Antagonist must give me leave to give credit to *Azorius*, (who, by the by, does also declare, that it is the sense also of the Council of *Nice* and of *Trent*) when he tells us this is the constant Opinion of their Theologers, especially the more ancient Schoolmen, as *Alexander Hales*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, &c. as keeping to the right sense of Pope *Adrian* and this seventh general Council called on purpose to decide this matter of Images. And if you have changed of late from this Rule, it is but a concession how grosly you were lapsed into Idolatry before. Nor are you yet a jot mended, by saying it is Analogically the same VVorship, it still remaining Religious VVorship terminated in the Images themselves; which is a gross blot, and makes the matter worse than before. But to make

make the Worship equivocally the same, is such an equivocating quibble to put on these two Saints of *Rome*, St. *Thomas*, and St. *Bonaventure*, that all the honour done to their Images will not recompense this injury done to their Memorie.

And thus I have used my Christian liberty, which my Adversary so courteously allowes me, in impugning *Gabriel Biel*, and whosoever else do corrupt the genuine sense of *Thomas Aquinas*, and *Bonaventure*, with such pittifull glosses. And whereas he says the Council of *Trent* never mentions any such Worship of *Latria* due to the Image of Christ; I Answer, it mentions the Council of *Nice*, and refers to the sentence of that Council, which assuredly was the same that *Azorius* says is the constant Tenet of Theologers. And thus consequentially at least does the Council of *Trent* declare for *Latria* to the Image of Christ. Besides, as I have noted; *Azorius* is of Opinion that the Council of *Trent* of it self is of this judgement. But of this enough, Nor has he any thing else on this second Paragraph which may not easily be Answered from what is said already.

His Answer to the third Paragraph.

Here is a Calumny, saith he, of the first Magnitude, most uncharitably implying that the Roman *Church prayes to Images as the Heathen did to their Idol-Gods. The charge is so gross that no Person but one remove from a fool can*

either believe the Doctor, or think he believes himself.

The Reply.

Truly I think there were very few among the Pagans that were so silly and unwise, as to take the very wood and stone they prayed to for a God, but for the Image of that God they prayed to, towards which they doing their devotions hoped to be heard. There might be some so sottish amongst them, as I have heard a story long since of an old woman amongst you, who having done her devotions to the Image of the Virgin, and being asked by one that stood by, what Lady she prayed to, to her in the Church, or to her in Heaven; what talk you to me, says she, of our Lady in Heaven? I pray to this Lady before my eyes. I will not deny but there may have been such sottish old wives amongst the Pagans too; But assuredly for the most part neither you nor they profess to pray to the very Image of wood or stone, but to the Prototype it is consecrated to. And now say, whether this Calumny of the first magnitude has not melted into a liquid Truth: There is no praying to the Image terminatively but to the Prototype before the Image, in either the Pagan, or Pagano-Christian Religion, unless by such doting old wives as that story goes on. The very meanest and most ignorant of the Indians will profess, they do not take their Pa-Gods, or Idols, to be Gods, or Worship them as such, but Worship God in them,

them, as I am certainly informed by a carefull inquirer into those things.

His Answer to the fourth Paragraph.

Chemnitius *his word, says he, is no proof with us, who is a known* Sinon, *a person of that tryed integrity, as that he that never trusts him shall be sure never to be deceived by him. This he makes another Calumny.*

The Reply.

But this, I say, is a kind of an equivocating form of rayling against a very eminent person, for his great learning and faithfull industry in supporting the Truth. But why a *Sinon* I pray you?

Si miserum fortuna Sinonem
Finxit, vanum etiam mendacemque improba finget.

If he undertook a miserable Cause, destitute of all Truth and solidity, as your Party does in such Points as we are upon, then indeed there were some temptation for him to do as some at least of you do, to use slights, and shifts, and tricks, to foist in, and to expunge by expurgatory Indexes, to feign any thing plausible for your own advantages: but our Cause being firm of it self, we are put to no such devices; but if we were destitute of Truth on our part, would willingly imbrace it where we find it. Or if you could phancy *Chem-*

nitius a *Simon*, could you phancy him ſuch a fool to quote Conſecrations out of a known *Pontifical*, where every body might ſee there is no ſuch thing. I am glad I have the *Ritual* by me, which I make uſe of in the next Paragraph, that proves that there is ſuch a thing as Conſecration of Images in your Church to be prayed before, and the Saint whoſe Image it is to be invoked before it. But in that Conſecration, you will ſay, there is no mention of Thundring and Lightning, and Storms to be chaſed away by theſe Images conſecrated. But I beſeech you what more of abſurdity or incredibility, that the Church of *Rome* in honour to their Saints ſhould conſecrate their Images to theſe purpoſes, than that ſhe ſhould conſecrate bells to the ſaid uſes? as you may ſee abundantly in *Durandus* his *Rationale*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. *Pulſatur & benedicitur Campana ut fruges, mentes & corpora credentium ſerventur, procul pellantur hoſtiles exercitus & omnes inſidiæ Inimici, fragor grandinum, procella turbinum, impetus tempeſtatum & fulgurum temperentur, infeſtaque tonitrua & ventorum flamina ſuſpendantur, ſpiritus procellarum & Aereæ Poteſtates perterreantur, &c.* When they conſecrate bells to ſuch mighty Powers and effects as theſe, can any man that is but one remove from a fool, doubt whether they would conſecrate the Image of St. *John* and the bleſſed Virgin to ſuch like purpoſes? Their *Agnus Dei* is alſo conſecrated to the like uſes, as you may ſee in the ſame *Durandus*, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 79. And in the above ſaid *Ritual* you may obſerve I know not how many things to the like purpoſe,

purpoſe, The *Croſs, Oyle, Salt, Water,* and the like: So that he muſt be very weak that can misbelieve this Quotation of *Chemnitius* out of the *Pontifical* he mentions, or that it is any Calumny to produce his Teſtimony, or improper for me to uſe it, though he be a Proteſtant, my ſcope being not onely to grapple with the adverſe Party, but alſo to confirm our own.

His Anſwer to the fifth Paragraph.

There is no ſuch expreſſion, ſays he, in the whole Prayer, as Grant O Virgin, *or* Grant O Saint, *but* Grant O God. *How then do we here make the Virgin and other Saints, fellow-diſtributers of Grace and Glory with Chriſt himſelf? Much leſs do we make them fellow-diſtributers of Grace and Glory with Chriſt upon their own Merits, who have no Merits of their own, but ſuch as flow from and have their abſolute dependence of the Merits of Chriſt. And leaſt of all are they here made fellow-diſtributers of Grace for the ſervice done to them in kneeling and praying before their Statues; there being no ſuch* cauſal *as that* (For) *ſpecified at all in the Prayer.*

The Reply.

To all which I Anſwer, It is true, it is not ſaid, *Grant O Virgin,* nor *Grant O Saint,* but *Grant O God,* becauſe this is a form of conſecration of the Images of Chriſt, the Virgin or any other Saint; to wit, a Prayer to God (not to the Virgin or any other Saint, nor made before any of their Images already conſecrated, as he would make his ſimple

folk believe whom he indeavours to keep in ignorance) but is, I ſay, a Prayer to God, that whoſoever ſhall invoke Chriſt, the Virgin, or ſuch a Saint, whoſe Image is a-conſecrating, may be heard, and obtain by the Merits and Interceſſion of the party they pray to, grace here, and glory hereafter. This is the plain ſenſe of the Conſecration. And it is plain it is through their own Merits, though they may be ſuppoſed inabled ſo to merit by vertue of Chriſt. And if an Invocation of the Virgin, or any other Saint, before their Images, by their Merits and Interceſſion (which is the uſual form of Invocation as you may ſee above) procure Grace here and Glory hereafter, are not they fellow-diſtributers of Grace and Glory with Chriſt? And does not the very form of Conſecration imply that they are Diſtributers, that is to ſay, that the Saints by their Merits and Interceſſion do procure Grace here and Glory hereafter for their Suppliants, upon the very account of their earneſt and humble ſupplication to them before their Images, as being a means to this end and therefore *Cauſal* thereto? But I do not exclude herein the vertue of the Interceſſion and Merit of our higheſt Mediator Jeſus Chriſt no more than the form of Conſecration. Yet theſe notwithſtanding are like the *Dii Medioxumi* or *Dæmons* of the Heathens, who were the loweſt Negotiators of humane affairs with the Divine Powers. So that the ſtrenghth of this Paragraph reſts firm for any thing my Antagoniſt has alledged againſt it, as any one may perceive who liſts to conſider on it.

His

His Answer to the sixth Paragraph.

To that about Wax-candles burning before their Images and the Oblation of Incense smoking before them, he says, I pretend, but do not prove to be Idolatrous, and that therefore it is a Calumny. To that of Temples and Altars he says again, they erect them to God alone, reserving onely a secundary honour for the Saints. This is the sum against this Paragraph.

The Reply.

To the first, I Reply, That it is very plain that burning of Incense was a Sacrifice to God in the Mosaical Law, which Incense was burnt before His symbolical Presence in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, And I add also that the lighting the Lamps before him in the same place was another part of this Mosaical service to him, which is some-how imitated by the Pagans in lighting Candles before the Images of their *Dæmons*. In both which respects it is plain, that to do thus to the Images of the Saints is Idolatrous. And by thus doing the Saints are intended to be honoured according to the very *Nicene* Council, that presently upon the mention thereof, says, *The honour done to the Image passes to the Prototype*: wherefore that these actions are Idolatrous is plain already, and is more clearly confirmed from the third Conclusion of the first Chapter, and the ninth of the second.

To the Second, I Reply, That the very Rubrick of the *Ritual* I have so often named (in the form of consecrating and laying the first stone of the Church) says thus, *Nominando Sanctum vel Sanctam in cujus honorem ac nomen fundatur Ecclesia.* Is not this plainly a consecration to the honour and name of the Saint? And again in the Form of consecrating the Church and the Altar, *Te rogamus ut hanc Ecclesiam & Altare ad honorem tuum & nomen Sancti tui* N. *purgare & benedicere digneris*, where questionless [*ad nomen Sancti*] includes *honorem* in it, which was expresly signified before in the consecrating the Foundation-stone, and is also included in the signification of *nomen*. We do not pretend that you equalize the Saints, in these doings, with God himself, but that you make them partake of true Religious Worship, though in a less share or in a more secundary way, with God in these dedications of Temples and Altars to them as well as to God, though not principally, or equally. Suppose a *Pantheon* dedicated to *Jupiter* and the rest of the Gods, no man would say it was dedicated with equal honour to the rest as to him, and yet the dedicating of it to the rest would be Idolatry, as being Religious Worship as well as his, though not at the same pitch; wherefore these excuses are very weak and insignificant.

His Answer to the seventh Paragraph.

I shall not foul my paper with taking notice of such unseemly brothel-language as fills up his next page.

It

It is enough to ſay, it is more than becomes a modeſt Doctor. This is all to this Paragraph.

The Reply.

Certainly if this Paragraph were not before the Readers eyes to peruſe, he would think the Doctor a man of very foul and obſcene language. If it be the language of the holy men of God in the Scripture, If it be not more than becomes a modeſt Prophet, a modeſt St. *John*, *Apoc.* 17. 2, 4. a modeſt *Jeremy* or *Ezekiel* to compare Idolatry to whoredom in broader terms than I have done, certainly what I have ſaid here is not more than becomes a modeſt Doctor. But it is the Policy of my Adverſary to fling away with a ſeeming diſdain from what he knows not how to Anſwer. For this plain Similitude pinches hard and carries along with it a demonſtration, that the Council of *Trent* have not taken away Idolatry from their way of honouring of Images, but confirmed it. He ſlips by my eighth Paragraph alſo, as conſcious it is too true what I utter in that ſimilitude likewiſe. And I hope he now ſees more clear than ever, that the pretenſe of honouring Images is quite to be caſt out of the Church, there being no good ſenſe to be made of it any way.

His Anſwer to the ninth Paragraph.

To that of the ſmiling, and lowring Images, he ſays, That I charge their Church with connivence at ſuch Un-

Unchristian Impostures as have ever been the Object of her sharpest Censures, not backing my Accusation with any single Instance. To the Veronica *and to* O Crux spes Unica, *he Answers; To the first, that it is no part of any Ecclesiastick Office. To the second, that I might as well compare the Invoking God Almighty before the Ark of the Covenant to this devotion of speaking to the Cross, as the praying before Images, and make them both alike talking with a stock or stone. This is the main of his Answer in brief: If there be any further pretense of Reason, I shall mention it and meet with it in my Reply.*

The Reply.

To the first I Reply, That it is a witty fetch to require of me an Instance of connivence at a fault which, as soon as it is known, is no interest of them that are to punish it to connive any longer at it. For those smiling, lowring and eye-rowling Images, so soon as they are deprehended to be such by Art and not by Miracle, they loose the effect they are intended for, which is to bring more plenteous Oblations to the Church. But for as much as these tricks of the Images cannot but be known to the wise of the Clergy, the Bishop and others under him, to be tricks and not Miracles, and they suffering them till open discovery or complaint, why may they not be said to connive at them? or why was I bound to bring an Instance of their connivence in so short a

Treatise,

Treatise, more than my Adversary of any sharp Censure of their Church against these Impostures? which he being deficient in, I will help him with one Instance here in our own Nation in the time of Popery.

In the Abbey Church at *Boxley* there were two famous Images, one of St. *Rumwald*, a stone statue of the bigness of a little boy, the other was called the *Rood of Grace*. There was no admission here but upon a treble Oblation, one to the Confessor, the other to St. *Rumwald* the *touch-stone of clean life*, and the last to the *Rood of Grace*. Now to those that offered frankly to St. *Rumwald* it was most easie to lift him; but on the contrary (by reason of a pin which the keepers could put in and take out at their pleasure) to those that offered faintly, it was immovable. So that it was a pleasant spectacle to the by-standers, to see a great lubber not able to lift that which a boy or a girle had taken up before. But he was made heavy to those whose Offerings were *light*, and *light* to those whose Offerings were more weighty. But they having passed this tryal of clean life, they then were admitted to the *Rood of Grace*. In which Image stood a man inclosed, and with many wyres made the Image goggle with the eyes, and nod the head, move and shake the jaws, according to the value of the gift that was offered. If it was a small piece of silver he would hang the lip. If it were a piece of gold then would his jaws go right merrily. Thus were the people abused and beguiled for a certain time.

I but

I but you will ſay, certainly ſome of the Prelates, ſo ſoon as it was diſcovered, ſeverely puniſhed the Impoſture. Nay I will tell you more, One of the Prelates diſcovered it, namely Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, and the Image with all its engins was openly ſhewed at *Pauls* Croſs, and torn in pieces by the people. Did not I tell you ſo? will my Adverſary reply; But in the mean time let me tell him again, that it is well known how inclinable then Archbiſhop *Cranmer* was to Proteſtantiſm, if not a Proteſtant in his judgement. But we ſpeak of the Connivence of the Popiſh Clergy in this point, and deſire one Inſtance of any ſuch diſcovery of Impoſture by them, that could any longer have been concealed. And if not, where is the Calumny of Connivence?

And for the Prayer to the *Veronica*, be it no part of any Eccleſiaſtick Office, yet it is in your approved Devotion-books, ſuch as *Hortulus Animæ*; and this *Veronica* is ſhowd ſolemnly once a year to the people to ſpend their devotion on; and laſtly Pope *John* the 22d. is ſaid to have granted a thouſand years indulgence to them that repeat the whole Prayer, of which I have ſet down but a third part.

And in the laſt place, For that he ſays, The praying before the Ark to God Almighty (which Ark and the things in it and about it are wood) may as well be ſaid to be talking with ſtocks and ſtones as the praying before the Image of a Saint and the Croſs in ſuch formes as are uſed to them, is a moſt ſenſleſs and abſurd ſpeech, to

ſay

no worſe. For the diſparity is manifeſt. For did the Jews ever ſay, *O Ark hear me*, or, *O* Cherubims *hear me.* But here is plainly ſpeaking to the Croſs, which is but a piece of wood, (in this form) *Hail O Croſs our onely Hope, increaſe righteouſneſs to the righteous, and pardon our ſins.* Beſides, neither Ark nor Cherubim was in their ſight to ſpeak to, But the Image of St. *Peter*, or the *Bleſſed Virgin* is before their eyes, and they bear the names of theſe Saints, (as the Image of Chriſt does his; of which one *Johannes* in the *Nicene* Council declares, if any one call it or inſcribe upon it, *This is Chriſt*, he does nothing amiſs therein) and are as it were theſe very Saints repreſented to us in Figure and Perſon; and therefore when we ſpeak to theſe wooden Perſonages, ſaying, *O bleſſed Virgin*, *O holy St.* Peter, *&c.* is not this infinitely more like talking to ſtocks and ſtones, then when the Jews having their faces toward the Ark, which yet was vailed from them, mentioned God alone? nor was there any wood-work, nor ſtone-work there, that was called God or Jehovah. But what will not they ſay, that are in a bad Cauſe, to make a ſhow to defend themſelves?

But for *O Crux ave ſpes Unica*, he would excuſe the groſs abſurdity of it, (For none can excuſe the Idolatry, when they yield *Latria* to the true Croſs and contend what kind of Religious Worſhip is due to the Type of it) by ſaying that by *Crux* here is not meant the Croſs but Chriſt crucified on the Croſs. So that it is but a figurative ſpeech,

The

The Cross for Christ upon the Cross, *Metonymia Subjecti*; as it is used, 1 *Cor.* 1. 18. *For the preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness*, that is, says he, *Christ crucified on the Cross.* But it is immediately in the former verse, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *lest the Cross of Christ be made of none effect.* Then immediately follows, ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, which is plainly an *Ellipsis*, and τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be understood διὰ τοῦ, And so the whole is, *For the preaching of the Cross of Christ*, &c. As it is taken, *Gal.* 6. 24. *God forbid that I should glory in any thing saving in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby the world is crucified to me, and I unto the world.* This is that which is foolishness to them that perish, but the Power of God to them that are saved. So that there is no ground for a *Metonymia Subjecti*, when an *Ellipsis* is so naturally understood, which will not at all serve his purpose. And the Metonymy indeed very poorly.

For it does not follow, because by a figurative speech the Subject may be put for the Adjunct, or the Symbol for the Person it is compared to in speech, that therefore we may (and yet seem to be in our wits) make Prayers or speeches to these Subjects or Symbols. The Cherubims are the seat of the Divine Presence; should the Jews therefore have said by a Metonymy, O golden Cherubims come and help us? And because men talk of the infallible chair at *Rome*, meaning the Popes, would any but a mad man propound questions to the chair, and not to the Pope himself,

to

to be resolved? And our Saviour Christ says, *Apoc.* 22. *I am the bright morning Star*, which is a figurative speech; Can therefore any one with eyes and hands lift up to the morning Star, say unto it, O bright morning Star illuminate my understanding, increase righteousness to the righteous, and pardon our sins, but he will be lookt upon as an Idolater and Star-worshipper? and to say he means Christ the morning Star will not excuse him from mere madness and delirancy, if it could from Idolatry. And how much better, I pray, is it to speak to a piece of wood? nay, to the figure of another piece of wood? For Christ was not crucified on the wood they speak to. But by speaking to this piece of wood, they would be understood to speak to another piece of wood on which Christ was crucified at *Jerusalem*; nor yet to that piece of wood neither, but to Christ hanging on the wood, and that now at such a time as he is off of the wood, and is in Heaven to be spoke to himself as a gracious Intercessor, that we may not call on this stock or that stone, but make our immediate addresses to him in word and heart, that he would be graciously pleased to intercede with his Father for us.

To all which you may add, That comparing this passage of the Prayer with that which goes before, *Arbor decora & fulgida, Electa digno stipite Tam sancta membra tangere; Beata cujus brachiis Secli pependit pretium*, and how within a line or two after follows, *O Crux ave spes Unica*, &c. it is demonstratively plain, that it is the Cross it

self

it self, not Christ meant in this passage; unless you will make Christ his own Cross to hang upon, and make him distinct from his own Body and members. Whence the Absurdity and Idolatry of this devotion is most clearly manifest, and that it is no Calumny to charge them with it. The rest of this Section is καπνὸς πιπτικὸς or ῥητορικὸς if you will, and I will leave my Antagonist to injoy himself in the reek and perfume thereof.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Several all important Conſectaries from this clear Diſcovery of the groſs Idolatry of the Church of Rome; *with an hearty and vehement Exhortation to all men, that have any ſerious regard to their Salvation, to beware how they be drawn into the Communion of that Church.*

1. THus have we abundantly demonſtrated that the Church of *Rome* ſtands guilty of groſs Idolatry according to the conceſſions and Definitions of their own Council of *Trent*; that is to ſay, though we charge them with no more then with what the Council it ſelf doth own, touching the Adoration of the Hoſt, the Invocation of Saints, and the Worſhipping of Images. But we muſt not forget, in the mean time, that the Crime grows ſtill more courſe and palpable looking upon the particular forms of their Invocation of the Saints, and the Circumſtances of their worſhipping their Images, and yet ratify'd by the Popes, and corroborated by the uncontrolled practice of their whole Church: Which therefore muſt in all reaſon be the Interpreter of the minde of the Council. So that there is no evaſion left for them, but that they are guilty of as groſs and palpable Idolatry as ever was committed by the ſons of men, no leſs groſs then *Roman* Paganiſm it ſelf.

2. From whence, in the next place, it neceſſarily follows, that they are the moſt barbarous Murtherers of the Servants of God that ever appeared on the face of the Earth. For indeed if they had had Truth on their ſide ſo far, as that the things they required at the hands of the Diſſenters had been lawfull, (though not at all neceſſary;) yet conſidering the expreſs voice of Scripture, which muſt

be ſo exceeding effectual to raiſe conſciencious Scruples, and indeed to fix a man in the contrary Opinions, beſides the irrefragable Votes of common Senſe and Reaſon, and the Principles of all Arts and Sciences that can pretend any uſefulneſs to Religion in any of its Theoreticall Diſquiſitions; I ſay, when it is ſo eaſie from hence, if not neceſſary, for ſome men to be born into a contrary conſciencious Perſuaſion, it had undoubtedly even in this caſe been notorious Murther in the *Pontifician* Party, to have killed men for diſſenting from the Doctrine and Practice of their Church.

But now the Murtherers themſelves being in ſo palpable an Error, and requiring of the Diſſenters to profeſs Blaſphemies and commit groſs Idolatries with them, which is openly to rebell againſt *God* under pretenſe of obeying *Holy Church*, as they love to be called, they murthering ſo many hundred thouſands of them for this Fidelity to their Maker, and their indiſpenſable Obedience to the Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, this is Murther of a double dye, and not to be parallel'd by all the barbarous Perſecutions under the red Dragon, the Pagan Emperours themſelves.

3. From which two main Conſiderations it follows in the third place, that, conſidering the fit and eaſie congruity of the names of the Seven Churches and of the Events of the ſeven Intervalls (denoted by them) to the Prefigurations in the Viſions, there can be no doubt but that by *Balaam* mentioned in the Epiſtle to the Church in *Pergamus*, wherein *Antipas*, that is, the Oppoſers of the Pope, are murthered, the Papal Hierarchy is underſtood; as it is alſo by the Propheteſs *Jezebel* in the Epiſtle to the Church in *Thyatira*, who was alſo a Murthereſs of the Prophets of God, and both of them expreſly Patrons of Idolatry, as is manifeſt in the very Text.

Nor is it at all wonderful that *Balaam* and *Jezebel*, the one a man, the other a woman, ſhould ſignifie the ſame

ſame thing. For the falſe Prophet and the Whore of *Babylon* in the following Viſions of the *Apocalypſe* ſignifie both one and the ſame thing, *viz.* The Hierarchy of *Rome*, from the Pope to the reſt of their Eccleſiaſtick Body.

4. And what I have ſaid of the Viſion of thoſe Seven Churches, the ſame I ſay of all thoſe Expoſitions of the thirteenth and ſeventeenth Chapters of the *Apocalypſe*, and that of the little Horn in *Daniel*; namely, The words of the Prophecies being ſo naturally applicable to the Affairs of that Church, beſides the demonſtration of Synchroniſm, that the weight of thoſe two foregoing Concluſions being added thereto, there cannot be the leaſt doubt or ſcruple left, but that thoſe Interpretations are true; and that the Church of *Rome* is that Body of *Antichriſt*, that *Mother of Fornications and Abominations of the Earth*, that is, of multifarious Modes of groſs Idolatries, or that ſcarlet Whore on the ſeven Hills, that is alſo *drunk with the bloud of the Saints, and with the bloud of the Martyrs of Jeſus.*

5. And that therefore, in the fourth place, in the Church of *Rome* the Poiſon exceeding the Antidote, there can be no reaſon that Salvation ſhould be hoped for there. It is a ſad and lamentable Truth, but being a Truth, and of ſuch huge moment, it is by no means to be concealed. What God may do in his more hidden ways of Providence, he alone knows. And therefore we cannot ſay that every Idolatrous Heathen muſt periſh eternally: But to ſpeak no farther then we have commiſſion, and according to the eaſy tenour of the Holy Scriptures, we muſt pronounce, though with great ſadneſs of heart, that we have no warrant therefrom to think or declare any of the *Popiſh* Religion, ſo long as they continue ſo, to be in the ſtate of Salvation; and eſpecially, ſince that voice of the Angel which ſounded in the Intervall of *Thyatira*, ſaying expreſly, *Come out of her, my people, that ye be not*

partakers of her ſins, and receive not of her plagues; and the Apoſtle in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 6. 9. *Be not deceived, neither Fornicatours, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers*, &c. *ſhall inherit the Kingdome of God.* And thoſe of the Church of *Rome* are bound to continue Idolaters as long as they live, or elſe to renounce their Church; and therefore they are bound to be damned by adhering to the *Roman* Church, unleſs they could live in it for ever. For he that dies in ſuch a capital ſin as Idolatry without Repentnce, nay, in a blind, obſtinate perſeverance in it, how can he eſcape eternal Damnation?

6. But though we had kept our ſelves to the *Apocalypſe*, the thing is clear in that Book alone, ch. 22. ver. 14. 15. where all Idolaters are expreſly excluded from the Tree of Life: *Bleſſed are they that do his Commandments*, (and one of them, though expunged by *Rome*, is, *Thou ſhalt not worſhip any graven Image,*) *that they may have right to the tree of life*, &c. *For without are dogs, and Sorcerers and Whoremongers, and Murtherers, and Idolaters, and whoſo loveth and maketh a Lie.* All theſe are excluded the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*, and from eating the Tree of Life. Of which who eateth not is moſt aſſuredly detain'd in eternall death. As it is written in the foregoing Chapter, Apoc. 21. 8. that *Murtherers, and Whoremongers, and Sorcerers, and Idolaters, and all Liers, ſhall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimſtone; which is the ſecond Death.* What ſentence can be more expreſs then this?

7. But beſides this Divine ſentence againſt them, they are alſo αὐτοκατάκριτοι, they are ſelf condemned, or at leaſt give ſentence againſt themſelves, while they ſo freely pronounce that no Idolaters are to be ſaved; which they frequently do, to ſave their own Church from the reproach of Idolatry. For, becauſe ſome Proteſtants have declared for the Poſſibility of Salvation in the *Romiſh* Church, they farther improve the favour to the quitting them-

themſelves of the *guilt*, from others hopefull preſages that by an hearty implicit Repentance of all their ſins (even of thoſe that are the proper Crimes of that Church,) they may, through God's mercy in *Chriſt*, be delivered from the *puniſhment*.

This piece of Charity in ſome of our Party they turn to the fencing off all imputation of Idolatry from themſelves, arguing thus; That no Idolaters can be ſaved: But thoſe in the *Romiſh* Church may be ſaved, according to thoſe Proteſtants opinion: Therefore thoſe in the *Romiſh* Church are no Idolaters.

But moſt aſſuredly while they thus abuſe the Charity of *ſome*, even by their own Propoſition they muſt bring the ſentence of condemnation *from all the reſt* upon their own heads, as they have herein *given it againſt themſelves*, in ſaying that all Idolaters are damned, or that no idolater can be ſaved. For it is demonſtrated as clear as the Noon-light, in this preſent Diſcourſe, that the Church of *Rome* are Idolaters.

8. And in that of thoſe of our Church that ſay they may be ſaved upon a ſincere and hearty implicit Repentance of all their ſins, (wherein they include the Idolatries and all other Miſcarriages which they know not themſelves guilty of, by reaſon of the blinde Miſ-inſtructions of their Church,) no more is given them by this then thus, *viz.* That they are ſaved by diſowning of and diſmembring themſelves from the *Roman* Church, as much as it is in their power ſo to do, and by bitterly repenting them that they were ever of that Church as ſuch, and by being ſo minded, that if they did know what a corrupt Church it is, they would forthwith ſeparate from it. So that in effect thoſe of the *Roman* Church that ſome of ours conceit may be ſaved, are no otherwiſe ſaved, if at all, then by an implicit renouncing Communion with it, which *in Foro Divino* muſt go for an actual and formal Separation from it.

In which Poſition if there were any Truth, it will reach the honeſt-minded Pagans as well; but it can ſhelter neither, unleſs in ſuch Circumſtances, that they had not the opportunity to learn the Truth, which ſince the Reformation, and eſpecially this laſt Age, by the mercy of God, is abundantly revealed to the world. So that all men, eſpecially thoſe that live in Proteſtant Nations or Kingdoms, are without all excuſe; and therefore become obnoxious to God's eternall wrath and Damnation, if they relinquiſh not that falſe Propheteſs *Jezebel*, as ſhe is called in the Epiſtle to the Church in *Thyatira*, who by her corrupt Doctrines deceives the people, and inveigles them into groſs Idolatrous Practices.

9. Thus little is conceded by thoſe of our Reformed Churches that ſpeak moſt favourably of thoſe in the Church of *Rome*. And yet this little muſt be retracted, unleſs we can make it out, that any of that Church are capable of ſincere and unfeigned Repentance while they are of it. For to repent as a Thief, becauſe he is afraid to be hanged, is not that ſaving Repentance. But to repent as a true Chriſtian none can do, unleſs he has the Spirit of God, and be in the ſtate of Regeneration.

For true Repentance ariſes out of the deteſtation of the uglineſs of Sin it ſelf, and out of the love to the pulchritude and amiableneſs of the Divine Life and of true Virtue, which none can be touched with but thoſe that are Regenerate or born of God. Now thoſe holy and Divine Sentiments of the new Birth are ſo contrary to the Frauds and Impoſtures, to the groſs Idolatries and bloudy Murthers of the Church of *Rome*, which they from time to time have perpetrated upon the dear Servants of *Chriſt*, that it is impoſſible for any one that has this holy ſenſe, but that he ſhould incontinently fly from that Church with as much horrour and affrightment as any Countrey-man would from ſome evil Spectre, or at the approach of the Devil.

10. *He*

10. *He that is born of God ſinneth not*, ſaith S. *John*: 1 John 5.18. How then can they be ſo born whoſe very Religion is a Trade of ſin, and that of the higheſt nature, they ever and anon exerciſing groſs acts of Idolatry? beſides that they are conſenting (by giving up their belief and ſuffrage to the murtherous Concluſions of that Church) to all the barbarous and bloudy Perſecutions of the Saints that either have happened or may happen in their own times, or ever ſhall happen, by that Church; they become, I ſay, guilty thereof by adjoyning themſelves to this bloud-thirſty Body of men, with whom the Murther of thoſe that will not commit Idolatry with them, and ſo rebell againſt God, is become an holy Papal Law and Statute.

And therefore, I ſay, how can any man conceive that thoſe men are born of God who are thus deeply defiled with Murtherous and Idolatrous Impurities, but rather that they are in a mere blind carnal condition, and uncapable, while they are thus, of any true and ſincere Repentance, and conſequently of repenting of their daily Idolatries which they commit, and ordinarily (to make all ſure) *in ipſo articulo mortis*, and therefore are out of all capacity of Salvation while they are members of that Church? As plainly appears both by this preſent Reaſon fetch'd from the nature of Regeneration, as alſo from the judgement of the *Romaniſts* themſelves touching the ſtate of Idolaters after this life, and chiefly from the expreſs ſentence of the Spirit of God in Scripture, as I intimated before.

11. And therefore, in the fifth and laſt place, it is exceeding manifeſt how ſtupid and regardleſs thoſe Souls are of their own Salvation, that continue in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*; and how deſperately wild and extravagant they are who, never having been of it, but having had the advantage of better Principles, yet can find in their hearts to be reconciled to it. This

muſt be a ſign of ſome great defect in Judgement, or elſe in their Sincerity, that they ever can be allured to a Religion that is ſo far removed from God and Heaven.

12. But this Church, as the woman in the *Proverbs*, is, I muſt confeſs, both very fair of ſpeech and ſubtil of heart, and knows how to tamper with the ſimple ones right skilfully. She knows how to overcome all their carnal ſenſes by her luxurious Enticements. She has *deck'd her bed with coverings of Tapeſtry, with carved work, with fine linens of Ægypt.* She has *perfumed her bed with Myrrh, Aloes and Cinnamon*, Prov. 7. 16, 17. She entertains her Paramours with the moſt delicious ſtrains of Muſick, and chants out the moſt ſweet and pleaſing Rhymes, to lull them ſecure in her lap: Such as thoſe Idolatrous forms of the Invocation of the Virgin *Mary*, and of other Saints, which I have produced, of which ſhe has a numerous ſtore. Unto which I conceive the Prophet *Iſay* to allude in that paſſage touching the City of *Tyre*, repreſenting there myſtically the relapſing Church of *Rome*: *Take an harp, go about the City, thou harlot that haſt been forgotten, make ſweet Melody, ſing many Songs, that thou mayſt be remembred*, Iſa. 23. 16. See *Synopſis Prophetica*, Book 2. ch. 16.

13. She gilds her ſelf over alſo with the goodly and ſpecious Titles of *Unity*, *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, the power of working *Miracles*, of *Sanctity* likewiſe, and of *Infallibility*; and boaſts highly of her ſelf, that ſhe has the power of the Keys, and can give ſafe conduct to Heaven by *Sacerdotal Abſolution*; and, if need be, out of the *Treaſury* of the *Merits of holy men* of their Church, which ſhe has the keeping and diſpoſing of, can adde Oyl to the Lamps of the unprovided Virgins, and ſo piece out their Deficiency in the works of Righteouſneſs. Such fair ſpeeches and fine glozing words ſhe has to befool the judgements of the ſimple.

14. But as to the firſt, it is plain that that *Unity* that is by

by Force is no fruit of the Spirit, and therefore no Sign of the true Church: nor that which is from free Agreement, if it be not to good Ends. For *Salomon* describes an Agreement of Thieves or Robbers, heartening one another to spoil and bloudshed, and to enter so strict a society as to *have* but *one purse*, Prov. 1. 14. And therefore for a company of men, under the pretense of *Spirituality*, to agree in the inventing or upholding such Doctrines or Fictions as are most serviceable for a *worldly* design, and for the more easily riding and abusing the credulous and carnal-minded, thereby to be masters of their Persons and Wealth, this is no *holy Unity*, but an horrid and unrighteous *conspiracy* against the deluded Sons of *Adam*.

15. And for *Antiquity* and *Universality*, they are both plainly on the Protestants side, who make no Fundamentals of Faith but such as are manifestly contained in the Scripture: which is much more ancient, and more universally received, then any of those things upon whose account we separate from the Church of *Rome*, which are but the fruits of that Apostasie which, after four Hundred years or thereabout, the Church was to fall into according to Divine Prediction. So that we are as ancient and universal as the Apostolick Church it self, nor do we desire to appear to be the members of any Church that is not Apostolicall. Synopf. Prophet. *lib.* 2. *c.* 5.

And for their boasts of *Miracles*, which are produced to ratifie their crafty Figments, they are but Fictions themselves framed by their Priests, or Delusions of the Devil, according as is foretold concerning the coming of *Antichrist*, that Man of sin, (which the Pope and his Clergy most assuredly is,) namely, that *his coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders*, 2 Thess. 2. 9. So that they glory in their own shame, and boast themselves in the known Character of *Antichrist*, and

and would prove themſelves to be *Holy Church* by pretending to the Privileges of that *Man of ſin*, and by appealing to the palpable ſigns of the Aſſiſtence of the Devil. For from thence are all Miracles that are produced in favour of Practices that are plainly repugnant to the Doctrines of the Holy Scriptures.

16. But now, as for their *Sanctity*, what an *holy Church* they are, any one may judge upon the reading of the Lives of their Popes and Hiſtory of their Cardinals, and other Religious Orders of that Church of *Rome*; how rankly all things ſmell of Fraud and Impoſture, of Pride and Covetouſneſs, of Oſtentation and Hypocriſy; what monſtrous examples of Senſuality their *Holineſſes* themſelves have ordinarily been, of Fornication and Adultery, of Inceſt and Sodomie; to ſay nothing of Simonie, and that infernall ſin of Necromancy. But for *Murther* and *Idolatry*, thoſe horrid Crimes are not onely made familiar to them, but have paſſed into a Law with them, and are interwoven into the very Eſſence of their Religion. Judge then how *holy* that Church muſt be, whoſe Religion is the eſtabliſhment of Idolatry and Murther. Of the latter of which Crimes the *holy Inquiſition* is an Inſtance with a witneſs. And yet that Den of Murtherers, whoſe Office it is to kill men for not committing Idolatry, with the Church of *Rome* muſt needs bear the title of *Holy*.

17. And for their pretenſe of *Infallibility*, it is expreſly predicted in the *Apocalypſe* of S. *John*, as well as their laying claim to Miracles. For as the two-horned Beaſt is ſaid Apoc. 13. 13 to *do great Wonders*, and to *bring fire from Heaven*, which two-horned Beaſt is the Pope and his Clergy; ſo *Jezebel*, which is the ſame Hierarchy, is called the Woman that gives to her ſelf the title of *a Propheteſs*, Apoc. 2. 20. whoſe Oracles you know muſt be *infallible*. For ſhe does not mean that ſhe is a falſe Propheteſs, though indeed and in truth ſhe is ſo. And the Pope with his Clergy is judged to be ſo by the Spirit of God,

God, in that he is called the *falſe Prophet*, Apoc. 16. 13. as well as the two-horned Beaſt, in thoſe Viſions of S. *John*.

And while he pretends himſelf to be a Prophet, even without Divine Revelation, one may plainly demonſtrate that he is a falſe one from this one notorious Inſtance of Tranſubſtantiation; which is a Doctrine repugnant to common Senſe and Reaſon, and all the Faculties of the Mind of man, and bears a contradiction to the moſt plain and indubitable Principles of all Arts and Sciences, as I have proved above. So that we may be more ſure that this is falſe, then that we feel our own bodies, or can tell our toes and fingers on our hands and feet. Judge then therefore whether is more likely, that the Church of *Rome* ſhould be infallible, or Tranſubſtantiation a mere Figment, eſpecially it being ſo ſerviceable for their worldly Advantages, and they being taken tardy in ſo many Impoſtures and Deceits. So that Infallibility is a mere Boaſt.

18. And now for their *Sacerdotal Abſolution*, that they can ſo ſafely diſmiſs men to Heaven or ſecure them from Hell thereby, this power of their Prieſt is ſuch another vain Boaſt as that of Tranſubſtantiation. *Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God*, John 3. 3. And the form of words upon one's Death-bed can no more regenerate any one, then their Quinqueverbiall Charm can tranſubſtantiate the Bread and Wine into the Body and Bloud of *Chriſt*. Where the form of Abſolution has any effect, it muſt be on ſuch perſons as are already really regenerate and unfeignedly and ſincerely penitent: which I have ſhewn to be incompetible to any one ſo long and ſo far forth as he adheres to the *Roman* Church. So that in this caſe one *Æthiopian* does but waſh another, which is labour ſpent in vain.

There muſt be a change of Nature, or no externall Cere-

Ceremony nor words can do any thing. For the form of Abſolution is not a Charm, as I ſaid, to change the nature of things, but onely a Ticket to paſs Guards and Scouts, and to procure ſafe conduct to the Heavenly Regions. But if by Regeneration and due Repentance one has not contracted an alliance and affinity with the Saints and Angels, but is really ſtill involved in the impure and Helliſh nature, the grim Officers of that dark Kingdome will moſt certainly challenge their own, and they will be ſure to carry that Soul captive into a ſutable place, let the flattering Prieſt have diſmiſſed her hence with the faireſt and moſt hopefull circumſtances he could. This is the moſt hideous, the moſt dangerous and the moſt perfidious Cheat of that Church of *Rome* that ever ſhe could light on for the damning of poor credulous Souls, that thus ſuperſtitiouſly depend on the vain breath of their Prieſt for the ſecurity of their Salvation.

19. And yet they are not content with this Device alone to lull men ſecure in wickedneſs, but beſides their pretenſe of ſinging them out of Purgatory by mercenary Maſſes, and pecuniary Redemptions, by Pardons and Indulgences, and I know not what Trumperies, they allure men to come into their Church as having that great Store and *Treaſury of the Merits* of Holy men and women, their works of *Supererogation*, which they pretend to have the keeping and diſpoſing of. So that a poor Soul that is bankrupt of herſelf, and has no ſtock of Good works of her own, may ſufficiently be furniſhed for love or money by the Merchants of this Storehonſe. Which, beſides that it is a blaſphemous Derogation to the Merits of *Chriſt*, is the groſſeſt Falſhood that ever was uttered.

For theſe Holy men, as they are called, and Virgins, were, God wot, themſelves moſt miſerable Sinners, and died in moſt horrid Idolatries, as dying in the Practices of that Church; and he that comes to that Church does

does neceſſarily become a groſs Idolater himſelf; beſides that he ſets to his ſeal and makes himſelf acceſſory to all that innocent bloud, the bloud of thoſe many hundred thouſands of Martyrs for the Proteſtant Truth, which that Woman of bloud that ſits on the Seven Hills has with the moſt execrable Circumſtances imaginable ſo frequently murthered. So that a Soul otherwiſe paſſable of her ſelf would be neceſſarily drown'd in this one foul Deluge of Guilt: ſo far is ſhe from having any relief or advantage by reconciling her ſelf to the Church of *Rome*.

20. Wherefore who-ever thou art that haſt any ſenſe or ſolicitude for thy future ſtate and Salvation, believe not this Woman of ſubtil lips and a deceitfull heart, and give no credit to her Fictions and high Pretenſions; but the more ſhe goes about to magnifie her ſelf, do thou humble her the more, by ſhewing her her ugly hue in the glaſs of the Holy Scriptures.

If ſhe boaſt that ſhe is that holy *Jeruſalem*, Pſal. 122. 3. a City at Unity within it ſelf, whenas the reſt of the World are ſo full of Sects and Factions; tell her that ſhe is that carnal *Jeruſalem*, wherein *Chriſt* in his true Members hath been ſo barbarouſly perſecuted and murthered, and that the Stones of her buildings are no living ſtones, but held together by a mere iron violence, and the Cement of her walls tempered with the large effuſion of innocent bloud; foraſmuch as ſhe is that two-horned Beaſt that gave life to the Image of the Beaſt, Apoc. 13. and cauſed him to decree that as many as would not obey his Idolatrous Edicts ſhould be ſlain. This is the power of your Unity, which is not from the Spirit of God, but from the ſpirit of the Devil, who was a Murtherer from the beginning. But the Diviſion of us Proteſtants is both a ſign of our ſincere ſearch after the Truth, and a more ſtrong Teſtimony againſt you of *Rome*, in that we being ſo divided amongſt our ſelves, yet we ſo unanimouſly give ſentence againſt you: your Miſcarriages

and

and Crimes being ſo exceeding groſs, that no free eye but muſt needs diſcern them.

21. If ſhe vaunts of her *Antiquity*; give her enough of it, and tell her ſhe derives her pedigree from that great Dragon, the *old* Serpent, Apoc.12.9. that is called the Devil and Satan, that Murtherer of mankind. *Ye are of your father the Devil,* ſaith our Saviour, *and the works of your father will ye do. John* 8.44. We grant that the Viſage and Lineage of your Church reaches even beyond the times of the Apoſtles, the two-horned Beaſt reviving the Image of the Pagan Beaſt, the great red Dragon, by bringing up again his old bloudy Perſecutions and Idolatries. It ſuffices us, that our Church began with the Apoſtles;

If ſhe glories in her *Univerſality*, and in her large Territories; tell her ſhe is *that GREAT City which ſpiritually is called Sodom and Ægypt, where our Lord was crucified*: Apoc.11. And that ſhe is *Babylon the GREAT, the mother of Fornications and the Abominations of the Earth.*

If ſhe boaſt of the *power of the Keys*, and of *Sacerdotal Abſolution*; tell her that *he that is holy, he that is true, he that has the Key of David, he that openeth and no man ſhutteth, and ſhutteth and no man openeth,* Apoc.3. that is to ſay, our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, will never part with theſe Keys to his inveterate Enemy, that notorious Man of Sin, or *Antichriſt.*

If ſhe ſpread before thee her goodly wares of mercenary Maſſes, of Pardons and Indulgences, of the mutuatitious Good works of their pretended Holy men and women, or the Wealth and externall Glories of their Church, and varieties of rich Preferments and Dignities; ſay unto her, that ſhe is that City of Trade of whom it is written, *that no man buyeth her merchandiſe any more*; and again, *Alas, alas! that great City that was cloathed in fine linnen and purple and ſcarlet, and decked with gold and precious ſtones and pearls: For in one hour ſo great riches are come to nought. For her Merchants were the great men*

of

of the Earth, and by her Sorceries were all Nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of Prophets, and of Saints, and of all that were ſlain upon the Earth, Apoc. 18.

22. If ſhe would amaze thee with the ſtories of the wonderfull *Miracles* done by her; tell her that ſhe is that two-horned Beaſt Apoc. 13. 13, 14. that *doth great wonders, and that deceiveth them that dwell on the Earth by means of thoſe Miracles which he had power to do in the ſight of the* ten-horn'd *Beaſt*; or that falſe Prophet *working Miracles*, Apoc. 19. 20. *and deceiving them that receive the mark of the Beaſt, and worſhip his Image*, who together with the Beaſt is to be taken, and caſt alive into a lake of fire burning with brimſtone; or laſtly, that Man of Sin and Son of perdition, 2 Theſſ. 2. 9. *whoſe coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders.*

If ſhe would inveagle thee with her pretenſes of *Infallibility*, tell her that ſhe is that Woman *Jezebel*, Apoc. 2. 20. that calleth her ſelf a Propheteſs; or the Prophet *Balaam*, Apoc. 2. 14. that inſnared the *Iſraelites* in Idolatry; and that very falſe Prophet that together with the Beaſt is to be caſt alive into the lake of burning brimſtone, Apoc. 19. 20.

23. And laſtly, if ſhe would gull thee with that ſpecious and much-affected Title of *Holy Church*; tell her that the Spirit of Truth in the Divine Oracles, let her commend her ſelf as much as ſhe pleaſes, gives no ſuch Character of her, but quite contrary, declaring the See of *Rome* to be the Seat of Satan Apoc. 2. 13. and their Church his Synagogue Apoc. 3. 9. the Pope and his Clergy to be *Balaam* the ſon of *Bozor* Apoc. 2. 13, 14. who loved the wages of unrighteouſneſs, and who was the Murtherer of *Chriſt*'s faithfull Martyr *Antipas*; to be that Woman *Jezebel* who calls her ſelf a Propheteſs, but was indeed a Sorcereſs, and a murtherer of the true Prophets of the Lord Apoc. 2. 20. to be alſo that falſe Prophet, that is to be taken alive, and caſt into the lake of fire and brimſtone Apoc. 19. 20 to be that great

City

City that ſpiritually is called *Sodom* and *Ægypt*, where our Lord was crucified Apoc. 11. 8. to be the Beaſt that has the horns of a Lamb, but the voice of the Dragon, Apoc. 13. 11. decreeing Idolatries and cruel Perſecutions againſt God's people; to be that *Babylon* the great, Apoc. 17. Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth; the Woman on the ſeven Hills that is drunk with the bloud of the Saints and with the bloud of the Martyrs of *Jeſus*; and laſtly, to be that Man of Sin, 2 Theſſ. 2. that *notorious Antichriſt*, that oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God or is worſhipped, *whoſe coming is with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs in them that periſh, becauſe they receive not the love of the truth that they may be ſaved. For which cauſe God ſends them ſtrong deluſion, that they believe a lie. That they all might be damned that believe not the truth, but have pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.* As well πᾶς ὁ φιλῶν, as πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν ψεῦδος, as well all they that love the *Romiſh* Lies and Impoſtures, as all they that invent them, are here plainly declared in the ſtate of Damnation.

With this Noſegay of Rue and Wormwood antidote thy ſelf againſt the Idolatrous infection of that *ſtrange Woman*'s breath, Prov. 5. 3. *whoſe lips* yet *drop as an hony-comb, and her mouth is more ſmooth then oyl.* And be aſſured that that cannot be the *true Holy Church* wherein Salvation is to be expected, which the Spirit of God has marked with ſuch *unholy and helliſh* Characters, let her boaſt of her *own Holineſs* as much as ſhe will.

24. And if ſhe return this Anſwer to thee, That this is not to argue, but to rail in phraſes of Scripture; do thou make this ſhort Reply, That whiles ſhe accuſes thee of *railing* againſt *ſinfull and obnoxious men*, ſhe muſt take heed that ſhe be not found guilty of *blaſpheming* the *holy Spirit of God.* I confeſs theſe Prophetical Paſſages apply'd to ſuch perſons as to whom they do not belong were an high and rude ſtrain of Railing indeed, and quite out

out of the road of Christianity and common Humanity: But to call them Railings when they are apply'd to that very Party to whom they are really meant by that Spirit that dictated them, is indeed to pretend to a *sense of Civility towards men*, but in the mean time to become a *down-right Blasphemer* against the *Holy Ghost* that dictated these Oracles.

And that they are not mis-apply'd, any impartial man of but an ordinary patience and comprehension of wit may have all assurance desirable from that demonstration of the truth compriz'd in the eight last Chapters of the first Book of *Synopsis Prophetica*; to say nothing of the present *Exposition* of the Seven Epistles to the Seven Churches in *Asia*.

25. Wherefore, O serious Soul, whoever thou art, be not complemented out of the Truth and an earnest pursuance of thine own Salvation from a vain sense of the Applauses or Reproaches of men, or from any consideration what they may think of thee for attesting or standing to such Verities as are so unwelcome to many ears, but of such huge importance to all to hear. For no less a Game is at stake in our choice of what Church we adhere to, that of *Rome* or the *Reformed*, then the Possession of Heaven and eternal Life.

Wherefore stand stoutly upon thy guard, and whensoever thou art accosted by the fair words and sugar'd speeches of that cunning Woman, (who will make semblance of great solicitude for thy future Happiness, most passionately inviting thee to return into the *bosom* of *Holy Church*,) be sure to remember what an *Holy Church* she is according to Divine description; and that if thou assentest to her smooth Persuasions and crafty Importunities, thou dost *ipso facto* (pardon the vehemence of expression) adventure thy self into the jaws of Hell, and cast thy self into the *arms* of the Devil, *Matth.* 23. 15.

God of his mercy give us all Grace to consider what has been spoken, that we may evermore escape these Snares of Death. *Amen.*

THE END.

CHAP. X.

The Answers of my Antagonist to this 10th. *Chapter, and my Replies put together without any distinction of Paragraphs.*

HItherto I have reduced my Antagonists Answers to the Paragraphs of each Chapter. But now he does so overflow with humour, wit, and confusedness, and walks so aloft in Generals, that I cannot reduce this last Section of his on my last Chapter to any such particular distinctness, but must make what I can of things in that order they lye.

First then, my hearty Exhortation to men to take heed how they be drawn into the Communion of the Church of *Rome* he phancies may fitly be called Dr. *Taylor revived*, or a *second Dissuasive from Popery*: Whereupon he takes Occasion to give the different Characters of Dr. *Taylor* and my self. *For Dr.* Taylor *is a Person, says he, of a more refined and plausible Insinuation, a smooth tongue and oyly Expression, cloaking his many and great Disingenuities with fair glozing words in an affected strain of Scripture phrase, pretending to the power of Godliness. But Dr.* More *is a Polemical man, of a quite different Temper, His fiery zeal wears no mask, His disputing is open rayling, and his Arguments blustering words not always too much concerned whether true for else.*

To

To which I Reply, Whether he call my hearty Dehortation Dr. *Taylor revived*, or a *second Dissuasive from Popery*, he may please his own phancy in that, he shall find me a man of great humanity and facility in matters of that kind: And let Dr. *Taylor* be of one temper and my self of another, so there be no *Immoratity* in these different tempers, that is all one to me also. But when he talks of the great *Disingenuities* of Dr. *Taylor*, I suspect they are nothing else but great and hard Arguments against the errors of the *Roman* Church, which they cannot Answer; The same crime that I have been guilty of all along this book hitherto, and it's well I be not charged with *great disingenuities* my self at last; which now I think on't, I have been already under an *harsher* term, he calling that *calumny* in me, who seem to be a more rude Writer, which in Dr. *Taylor* that more smooth and oyly Arguer he termes a *disingenuity*. But it's needless for me to say any thing more of Dr. *Taylor*, his learned and eloquent writings will Answer for him and themselves too.

But now for my own Charge, That I am *Polemical*; I am sure I am neither Souldier, nor disputacious Schoolman. But if I be *Polemical* or *warlike*, it is in that warfare whose weapons are spiritual, as the Apostle speaks, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4. for the pulling down strong holds and inveterate Imaginations, raised against the truth of God and the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. And for my *fiery zeal that wears no mask*, the Apostle says, *Gal.* 4. 18. *It is good to be zealous in a good matter*, and as good to

be zealous against a bad one. And is not the spirit of God resembled to fire? Which where it appears in truth it will burn off all masks of Hypocrisy and make men walk in all simplicity of Conversation before God and before men. But why is my disputing open railing? If I speak any thing false, witness of the falsehood: But if the corruptions of your Church be such, that they cannot be named by their proper Names, such as all solid Theology, Philosophy and ordinary humane Laws would call them; in calling them so, am I a Rayler, or you very great and enormous sinners? I speak of those two grand crimes *Idolatry* and *Murder*, which are interwoven into your Religion. And whether my Arguments be *blustering words* or solid Reason, let any indifferent Reader judge by what has passed hitherto in your pretended Confutation of this Antidote against Idolatry, and in my so clearly proving my Reasonings therein to remain sound and unshaken for all the Battery you could lay against them. And whereas you add, *not always too much concerned whether true or false*, it is such an equivocating Imputation, that look one way on it, it says less than is true. For I confess I am never too much concerned whether I speak true or false, especially considering of what moment the things are I write of. But if you mean I am not always enough concerned, whether what I affirm be true or false: The tree is known by its fruits; shew me where I have trip't; or if I have any where trip't, prove that it was out of carelesne's whether it was true or false which I utter-

ed.

ed. And this I think he pretends he will show in this Dehortation of mine: For immediately he adds,

Witness the Contents of this Chapter, whereof I shall give my Reader a brief Extract drawn up in the Form of an Homily, yet in the Doctors own words and charitable Dialect. Thus then begins the Dissuasive. *Repl.* This is a *Dissuasive* of my Adversaries own making, whom though I acknowledge a man of Wit and Eloquence yet I will not trust him in making speeches for me; and seeing his *Dissuasive* is pretended but an Epitome of mine, and mine being already under the eye of the Reader, I hold it altogether impertinent to set down his, especially he putting his for mine, and calling it so, adding at the end of it, *This is Mellifluous Dr.* Mores *sweet harangue, &c.* The truth is he has made as dry and lank an Homily as he could, and heaped up those Titles their Church is adorned with in the Apocalypse, barely and nakedly without the Occasions and circumstances I bring them in upon, to make himself and his party merry, and to make my serious Exhortation to deceivable People that they take heed of the frauds and danger of that Church, to look ridiculously. But this is one Artifice of theirs amongst the rest, when the weight of Reason and Religion presses on them to any purpose to slip from under it by some ludicrous jest, or profane raillery. Wherefore letting this drollery pass, let us observe what in good earnest he would weaken my Exhortation by, or where is that

place in it where he will make good that Imputation against me, that I am *not enough concerned whether what I say be true or false.*

Now I would gladly know, says he, what there is in all this discourse, which an ingenuous *Son of the Church of* England *will not be heartily ashamed of, and even blush for the Doctors sake? Repl.* Why did you then make such a silly Oration in my name, that all the *ingenuous* Church-men in *England* should be ashamed of it? as well they might, if I had made such a jejune lank piece of stuff as your officiousness has made for me. But for mine I dare say, there is no *ingenuous* Son of the Church of *England* (unless you measure the *Ingenuity* and *Disingenuity* of men by their affection and disaffection to the errors of your Church, as you seem to do in Dr. *Taylor*) much less any *genuine* Sons of our Church, but will approve of the firmness, reasonableness and seasonableness of such an Exhortation.

Here is I confess, quoth he, stout railing, Disingenuity more than is necessary for a Doctor, &c. *Repl.* Here the Reader may be pleased to take notice of the *special* sense of *Disingenuity* with my Antagonist, namely, that it is the plainly speaking such Truths as argue the gross errors and perillous Enormities of the Church of *Rome.* Whenas it is ten thousand times more *disingenuous,* according to the law of God and Nature, to smother Truth to the great and real injury of both the Church of *Rome* and our own. And then for my *stout* Railing, which elsewhere he calls that *unmanly* Rhetorick

torick of Railing, let us put them together, The *stout unmanly* Rhetorick of Railing. I demand, If it be either *ferine* or *womanish* with a plain open Constancy to declare those Truths that are of such vast Concern and of so perspicuous a clearness to those that do not wilfully wink against them? Or if the propriety of language, and to declare according to the nature and true Notion of things, and that without all ill will, be any form of Rayling; Unless *Adam* in the state of Innocency railed when he gave names according to the natures of the Creatures? And this great Clamour against me of Railing, is because I call Idolatry *Idolatry*, and the killing of men because they will not commit Idolatry with the Church of *Rome*, *barbarous murder*. But if he mean because I call the Church of *Rome* by those Titles the Spirit of God calls her in the Apocalypse, my Apology is already made in the twenty fourth Paragraph of this 10th. Chapter. Which I desire my Antagonist, and every one it may concern, in the fear of God to peruse, and to consider the latter part of it touching those eight last Chapters of the first book of my *Synopsis Prophetica*, and my *Exposition of the seven Epistles to the seven Churches of* Asia. In both which *Expositions*, I challenge any diligent searcher to show any considerable flaw that will lessen the certitude of them for the main, or if they think there is the least faultering in this proposal, let them show any flaw at all if they can. For as for my self, though I have been an anxious searcher after Truth, I was never yet satisfied concerning any, more palpably than of

these I speak of. Which, God knows, I do not speak in the way of Boasting, but merely to excite the ingenuous to try the strength and evidence I find them, that they may thereby, after a manner whether they will or no, feel it also themselves and find it. Nor do I use those Names of Infamy wherewith the Spirit of God has branded the Pontifician Clergy, nakedly and without occasion, as my Antagonist has framed his frigid, flaccid and insipid *Dissuasive* which he would father upon me; but upon the Church of *Romes* false boasts of her self, whereby to tempt ours to her Idolatries, I put in their mouths what the Spirit of God says touching her in the Apocalypse, and other places of Scripture: Whereby is understood plainly how the *Mystery of Iniquity* is with them, and how when they make a specious show and boast of *being one thing*, the Spirit of God judges them the *quite Contrary*.

But further he adds; *That this Exhortation of mine is an ill-grounded and Schismatical Discourse, &c.* Thorndike *himself being Umpire in the Case. Repl.* As for Dr. *Thorndike* I shall consider him at the close; In the mean time it is apparent that my Exhortation is very well grounded, it being grounded upon sound and clear Reason and the Holy Scriptures of God, than which there is no surer ground in the world. And certainly no *genuine* Sons, what ever the *ingenuous* Sons of the Church of *England* may do, will ever say that it is Schismatical whenas the main end of it is to keep the members of our Church from making any

any Schism or separation from us, and from betaking themselves to the Church of *Rome*, who has separated herself from the purity of the Gospel.

But after this, most inhumanely and injuriously he parallels this faithfull and unexceptionable Exhortation of mine made to the people to keep them from the deceits and inticements of the Church of *Rome*, that they may not separate from the Church of *England* and Apostatize to her, to the bitter and rebellious Trumpeters of war in the late distempered times, who loudly out of the Pulpet thundred into the peoples ears, *Curse ye Meroz, yea curse ye bitterly, &c. And there are not wanting in this Nation, says he, those who can find* Rome *in* England *to make* Meroz *of it when they please. Repl.* Then they are those chiefly that are of your Emissaries gendring and fomenting. But it is well known to all the world, that it has been precisely and particularly my care and labour to distinguish what is truly Antichristan from what is not, that the Church of *England* might be cleared from such Imputations, and the saddle set on the right Horse; As you may see, Preface to my *Idea of Antichristianism*, Sect. 8. and in the two last Chapters of *Synopsis Prophetica* For my own part I dare say, there is none that know me either personally or by my writings that will not readily acknowledge, that nothing can be more removed from bitterness, persecution, tumult and rebellion, then that Spirit that I am of. Nor could I in those very times of rebellion and tumult forbear to testifie in publick my

disgust

diſguſt thereof, in theſe mean Rymes but of ſound and good ſenſe. *Immortality of the Soul*, Book 2. Cant. 3. ſtanz. 5.

Can wars and jars and fierce Contention
Swoln Hatred and conſuming Envy ſpring
From Piety? No, 'Tis Opinion
That makes the riven Heavens with trumpets ring
And thundring Engins mundrous balls out-ſling,
And ſend mens groaning Ghoſts to lower ſhade
Of horrid Hell. This the wide world doth bring
To divaſtation, makes mankind to fade,
Such direfull things doth falſe Religion perſwade.
But true Religion ſprung from God above
Is like her fountain full of charity,
Embraceing all things with a tender love,
Full of good will and meek expectancy,
Full of true juſtice and ſure verity
In heart and voice, &c.

It is not our telling you plainly and apertly, according to Truth and Scripture, what is hainouſly amiſs in you, that can be any prejudice to our own Church, but it is the *excuſing* you and *diſſembling* your *great* crimes by *extenuating termes*, and *your* aggravating every *little* Ceremony of ours, ſuch as kneeling at the Communion and the like, to make us odious to the ignorant people, that makes us ſuſpected of *Romaniſm*. But this is one of your Arts amongſt many others to make thoſe that are the moſt hearty well-willers to the Church of *England* the moſt ſuſpected by them. But Truth and

and Innocency bids defiance to all your devices.

But in the meantime where is the charge made good of being so little concerned whether I speak true or false *in this Exhortation of mine? Why, at last it is this, That I so peremptorily aver, that no Protestants allow them a possibility of Salvation, but onely in case of such a Repentance as implies an absolute renunciation of their Religion and its Idolatrous doctrines and practises by disowning of and dismembring themselves from the* Roman *Church. Which, says he, will scarce appear pardonable in the eyes of his fellow Doctors.* *Repl.* This is a charge founded upon the eighth Paragraph of this tenth Chapter, I desire the Reader to peruse the Paragraph and compare it with his charge: where, after [disowning and dismembring themselves from the *Roman* Church] he omits a special Clause which immediately follows, *viz.* [As much as it is in their power so to do.] Which is quite another thing from actually renouncing of their Church, while they have not the opportunity of discovering her gross Errors; but that their general Repentance is so hearty and unfeigned, that it would descend to this particular upon the detection to them of the foul errors of that Church. And this I hope will not onely be pardonable but acceptable to those eminent men of our Church, Arch-bishop *Laud*, Bishop *Abbot*, and the rest he names out of Bishop *Laud*, *Relation* Sect. 35. who examined to the bottom will appear of the same mind with my self. And for that of Mr. *Hooker* in his *Discourse of Justification*, Sect. 17.

17. where he says, *For my part I dare not deny possibility of their Salvation, who have been the chiefest Instruments of ours.* Which Quotation, which my Adversary so much glories in, it is evident, is nothing at all to the purpose. For as much as he speaks not here of those of the Church of *Rome* since the Reformation but before, when the state of the Church was the *Woman in the Wilderness*, as is manifest both from the sentence it self quoted and the Context. But if Mr. *Hookers* Authority be of any weight with you, do but look into the foregoing Section, and he will tell you the Church of *Rome* hath plaid the Harlot worse then ever did *Israel.* And now I demand, for a Christian who is part of the Body of Christ to adjoyn himself to the Church of *Rome*, what is it but to make a member of Christ the member of an Harlot? as the Apostle speaks, 1 *Cor.* 6. 15. And is that, I pray, the next way to the Capacity of Salvation? But this by the by.

After this he brings in Dr. *Potter* and Dr. *Hammond*, glorying much of the charitable principles of the Church of *England* and Objecting want of charity to them, for maintaining that Protestancy unrepented destroyes Salvation: Now if the Objectors should retaliate and say, that Popery unrepented destroyes Salvation, I would willingly be instructed, saith he, by Dr. *More, wherein lyes the charity and moderation they boast of.* Why, I'll tell you; In this, That whereas Protestancy, that is, Christian Religion *quatenus* reformed from the errors of *Rome* wants no repentance, and the Errors and mispracti-

mispractises of the Church of *Rome* are so hainous and enormous, that most Protestants, comparing the Crimes of that Church with the menaces of Scripture, do conclude the Adherers thereto in the state of Damnation without any more to do, so soon as they adhere unto it, Dr. *Hammond* and Dr. *Potter* are so charitable, that though men dye in that Church, yet by a general sincere repentance, such as implies that if their Errors and mispractises were discovered to them to be such they would forthwith leave the Communion of that Church, declare they may be saved, which is the same I profess too. But we declare in the mean time, that it is perfect madness in any one to go over to such a Church in which there is no Salvation but upon supposition that if we knew the gross Errors and mispractises of it, we would presently renounce Communion with it, which if we did not we should certainly be damned.

But behold a third fetch also; *Nothing is more current, saith he, amongst them, when they are pressed with the Crime of Schism, then to return the Charge upon us from other grounds, saying, that as the* Donatists *and* Luciferians *were, so we are Schismaticks in cutting off from the Body of Christ and hope of Salvation other Churches from which we are divided in Communion. From which he would infer, that we should make* our selves Donatists *and* Luciferians *if we should cut* them *off from hope of Salvation.* To which I Reply, That this must be current onely amongst them that phancy themselves pressed with the Crime of Schism.

17. where he says, *For my part I dare not deny possibility of their Salvation, who have been the chiefest Instruments of ours.* Which Quotation, which my Adversary so much glories in, it is evident, is nothing at all to the purpose. For as much as he speaks not here of those of the Church of *Rome* since the Reformation but before, when the state of the Church was the *VVoman in the VVilderness*, as is manifest both from the sentence it self quoted and the Context. But if Mr. *Hookers* Authority be of any weight with you, do but look into the foregoing Section, and he will tell you the Church of *Rome* hath plaid the Harlot worse then ever did *Israel.* And now I demand, for a Christian who is part of the Body of Christ to adjoyn himself to the Church of *Rome*, what is it but to make a member of Christ the member of an Harlot? as the Apostle speaks, 1 *Cor.* 6. 15. And is that, I pray, the next way to the Capacity of Salvation? But this by the by.

After this he brings in Dr. *Potter* and Dr. *Hammond*, glorying much of the charitable principles of the Church of *England* and Objecting want of charity to them, for maintaining that Protestancy unrepented destroyes Salvation: Now if the Objectors should retaliate and say, that Popery unrepented destroyes Salvation, I would willingly be instructed, saith he, by Dr. *More, wherein lyes the charity and moderation they boast of.* Why, I'll tell you; In this, That whereas Protestancy, that is, Christian Religion *quatenus* reformed from the errors of *Rome* wants no repentance, and the Errors and mispracti-

mispractises of the Church of *Rome* are so hainous and enormous, that most Protestants, comparing the Crimes of that Church with the menaces of Scripture, do conclude the Adherers thereto in the state of Damnation without any more to do, so soon as they adhere unto it, Dr. *Hammond* and Dr. *Potter* are so charitable, that though men dye in that Church, yet by a general sincere repentance, such as implies that if their Errors and mispractises were discovered to them to be such they would forthwith leave the Communion of that Church, declare they may be saved, which is the same I profess too. But we declare in the mean time, that it is perfect madness in any one to go over to such a Church in which there is no Salvation but upon supposition that if we knew the gross Errors and mispractises of it, we would presently renounce Communion with it, which if we did not we should certainly be damned.

But behold a third fetch also; *Nothing is more current, saith he, amongst them, when they are pressed with the Crime of Schism, then to return the Charge upon us from other grounds, saying, that as the* Donatists *and* Luciferians *were, so we are Schismaticks in cutting off from the Body of Christ and hope of Salvation other Churches from which we are divided in Communion. From which he would infer, that we should make* our selves Donatists *and* Luciferians *if we should cut* them *off from hope of Salvation.* To which I Reply, That this must be current onely amongst them that phancy themselves pressed with the Crime of Schism.

Schism. But, ὦ πόπυες! How soft and yielding must they be, how weak and feeble, that can phancy themselves *pressed* with such an Objection? Certainly those must be but very few, And therefore this Answer must be current but with a very few. Our constant Answer is, that they are Shismaticks that depart from the Communion of the truly ancient and Apostolick Church. Of whose lineage we do avow our selves to be, and do plainly and irrefragably prove it. And therefore *you* are Apostates from *us* and Schismaticks that you do not cast off your enormous errors and hainous practises, and Communicate with *us*. But with the *Luciferians* and *Donatists* you make your selves more holy, and call us Hereticks when your selves are really the Hereticks and Schismaticks. In this are you like the *Donatists* and *Luciferians*, and unjustly take upon you to cut us short of Salvation. But does it thence follow, we justly declaring you debar'd of Salvation by reason of your open Idolatries and Murders of the innocent people of God, that we become thereby also *Donatists* and *Luciferians*? let any indifferent man judge.

But the last and strongest prop of so bad a Cause, is the great and venerable Authority of *Dr.* Thorndike an ingenuous Son of the Church of *England. Of whom he says, In regard I have mentioned so eminent a person and member of the Church of* England *as Dr.* Thorndike, *I shall make bold to turn him into the lists against Dr.* More. *The* Antithesis *of their doctrines is very remarkable; for they run diametrically Opposite one to another.* 1. *Dr.* More *affirms the*

Worship

Worship of the Host in the Papacy to be Idolatry. Dr. Thorndike (*ch.* 19.) *denies the Worship of the Host in the Papacy to be Idolatry.* 2. *Dr.* More *holds that the placing and reverencing Images in Churches is Idolatry.* Dr. Thorndike (*ch.* 19.) *holds that the placing and reverencing Images in Churches is not Idolatry.* 3. *Dr.* More *will have Invocation of Saints to be inexcusable Idolatry.* Dr. Thorndike (*ch.* 16.) *excuses Invocation of Saints from Idolatry.* 4. *Lastly,* Dr. More *exhorts all men to separate from the Church of* Rome, *as Idolaters. But* Dr. Thorndike (*ch.* 1.) *avows to all the world, that those who separate from the Church of* Rome *as Idolaters, are thereby Schismaticks before God. When the two Doctors are fully agreed upon these Points,* Dr. More *shall hear more from me, if he desires it. In the mean time I shall intreat him to respite my pen for some other Employment.*

Repl. Dr. *Thorndike*, I confess, is a Person, whom his years and repute of Learning have made venerable. But what is this to the point in hand? to the proveing the Charge of my being less regardfull then I should be in this Exhortation whether I speak true or false? This is a mere popular Topick, and this your whole last Section, wherein you would fain offer something against this last Chapter of my Antidote, but a loose and weak stroke of Rhetorick to drive the simple into your Church as I have seen men drive Geese or Turkies on the high way to *London*, with a stick and long string with a red cloth tyed at the end of it; as you annex the splendid name of Dr. *Thorndike* at the end of this Section, to either scare or incou-

rage

rage poor Souls to your Communion. But does Dr. *Thorndikes* being of another mind from me prove that I am in the wrong? If this be to confute a man, I can eaſily confute Dr. *Thorndike* himſelf, by ſhewing that Perſons not onely of very eminent Learning, but of clear and terſe judgments, differ from Dr. *Thorndike* in all theſe four Antitheſes. Mr. *Joſeph Mede* of our Colledge, who was ſo modeſt a Soul, that though he had worth to furniſh out I know not how many Doctorſhips never commenced Doctor, let us for the time, to make the Compariſon more plauſible, call him Doctor as well as my Adverſary does Doctor *Thorndike*, and then ſay, Dr. *Thorndike* denies the worſhipping the Hoſt to be Idolatry, Dr *Mede* affirms it to be Idolatry; Dr. *Thorndike* holds the honouring of Images in Churches to be no Idolatry, Dr. *Mede* affirms it to be Idolatry, &c. Where is Dr. *Thorndike* now? Nay ſuppoſe I ſhould put that eminently Learned Prelate of the Church of *England* and of ſingular clearneſs of Reaſon and Judgement, Biſhop *Downham* once of Chriſts Colledge, in the balance with Dr. *Thorndike*, who in theſe things is exquiſitely of the ſame mind with Dr. *Mede*, in what elevation would Dr. *Thorndike* appear then? The ſame I may ſay of the Archbiſhop of *Armagh*, Biſhop *Jewel*, Arch-biſhop *Abbot*, and ſeveral other Biſhops and Doctors of our Church, who at leaſt joyntly, if not in ſeveral, will ſurely counterpoize the weight of Dr. *Thorndikes* name. Indeed I might ſay the whole Body of our Church, as ſubſcribers to the Homilies of

our

our Church, affirm in all these points against Dr. *Thorndike*. Nay I dare with all confidence assert that no man can make any good sense of the 13th. and 17th. Chapters of the Apocalypse, but he will plainly discern that the very Spirit of God himself has declared against him. What poor and simple Souls then must they be that can be scared out of the Truth or kept in Error by such Topicks as these? Dr. *Thorndike* is not of the same mind with Dr. *More*, therefore Dr. *More* uses *blustering arguments not much concerned whether true or false*. For my part I desire no man take my Arguments or Assertions upon trust, but do appeal to Scripture and his own Reason whether what I say be not true, and would have him examine them accordingly. And therefore Dr. *Thorndike* must not be offended though I yield not to his name, though I have a due respect for him, till I have tried the strength of his Arguments, in each *Antithesis* to my Assertions.

As to the first Antithesis therefore where he denies the Worship of the Host in the Papacy to be Idolatry, Cap. 19. the short and long of his Argument is this, *That no Papist worships the Elements of the Eucharist nor the Accidents of it for God. Therefore no Papist in this Worship is an Idolater. He Worships not the Elements of the Eucharist because he does not believe them to be there, Nor the Accidents, as they call them, because he believes them to be no part of the Body of Christ into which the consecrated Bread is Transubstantiated.* But to this I briefly Answer, That the Bread Transubstantiated into the Body of

Chriſt and Hypoſtatically united with the Deity there where the Accidents ſhew us (ſo that they become that very Perſon God-man) is the intended Object of their Worſhip and Adoration, being viſible to them merely in vertue of thoſe Accidents or ſpecies that are like Bread. Now therefore it is plain if there be no ſuch thing as Tranſubſtantiation, that their Adoration paſſes upon a mere untranſubſtantiated piece of Bread inſtead of the Body or corporeal preſence of Chriſt, ſuppoſed to be veiled with thoſe Accidents of Bread; which therefore is plain Idolatry. For in that they are miſtaken in their Object and intended no Worſhip to a piece of Bread but to Chriſt, does not excuſe the Idolatry by the 4th. and 5th. Concluſions of the ſecond Chapter. See alſo Concluſion 21. and 22. as alſo the laſt Concluſion of the ſame Chapter. I have repreſented Dr. *Thorndikes* Argument with the utmoſt ſtrength I could poſſibly, and yet it is no other than you ſee.

To the ſecond Antitheſis, Dr. *More*, ſays he, *holds that the placing and reverencing of Images in Churches is Idolatry. Repl.* I do not hold that the mere placing of Images in Churches is Idolatry (though I muſt confeſs I had rather have their room than their Company) but onely the worſhipping of them. And now let us hear what Dr. *Thorndike* (Chap. 19.) alledges to the contrary; *In doing honour, ſaith he, to the Images of Saints there can be no Idolatry, ſo long as men take them for Saints, that is, Gods Creatures, much leſs to the Images of our Lord. For it is the Honour of our Lord and not of*

the

the Image. And a little after to the like ſenſe, *For indeed and in truth it is not the Image but the Principal (the* Nicene *Council calls it* Prototype *) that is honoured by the honour that is ſaid to be done to the Image becauſe it is done before the Image.* This is the ſum of his Argument to prove that Image-worſhip is no Idolatry. Now in order to the better underſtanding my Anſwer, you are Firſt to take notice that both my Adverſary and Dr. *Thorndike* underſtand ſuch Images as have honour done to them in the Church of *Rome*, *viz.* Images dedicated or conſecrated, as you have an example of the form above, and therefore ſuch as are the ſymbolical Preſences of their *Principals* or *Prototypes.* Secondly, That this honour here mentioned in general by Dr. *Thorndike* is the Honour done and allowed by the Church of *Rome* unto Images, *viz. Invocation before them, Incurvation, ſetting up Wax-candles and burning Incenſe before them. Now that the doing of this honour to theſe Images is not Idolatry, Dr.* Thorndike *would prove upon the Principle of Pope* Adrian *and the ſecond Council of* Nice; *Becauſe the Honour does* διαβαίνειν, *paſſes from or through the Image to the Principal, in ſo much that the Principal alone ſeems to be worſhipped not the Image; And this Principal being either the Saints or Chriſt, ſo long as we remember the Saints to be Gods Creatures it can be no Idolatry, much leſs in the Image of Chriſt, ſince the Principal or Prototype there is God.*

Repl. To the firſt of which I Anſwer, That the Primitive Chriſtians knew the Emperor to be Gods Creature, and even *eo nomine* becauſe they remem-

bred him to be Gods Creature would not cast a few grains of Incense into the fire in honour of him though it cost them their lives for not doing of it. And the departed Souls of the great Heroes or Benefactors among the Heathen, whom they after death made *Daemons* and worshipped them, were known well enough to be Gods Creatures, that is to say, the off-spring of the highest *Numen*, (Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν ----- as the Heathen Poet could say) and yet no Christians doubt but they were Idolaters in worshipping them. And therefore by the third and fourth Conclusions of the first Chapter the worshipping of the Images of the Saints though terminating on the Saints themselves is Idolatry. Besides Incurvation to an Image, such as is here practised, is Idolatry by the seventh and eighth Conclusions of the same Chapter. See also the nineteenth Conclusion of the second Chapter.

And then for the Image of Christ, though Christ be God, yet to Worship God by an Image is Idolatry; By the nineteenth Conclusion of the second Chapter, and by the second Commandment, and the fearfull vengeance on the Israelites for worshipping the golden Calf, which notwithstanding was the symbolical Presence of Jehovah.

And for the pretense that the Worship is done onely before the Image not to the Image; since the Image is a symbolical Presence dedicated to Christ or this or that Saint, and that these are the Instances of *Honor debitus, viz.* Incurvation toward it, burning Incense and the like, used by the Church of *Rome* and specified by the Council of

Nice

Nice to which the Council of *Trent* does refer, it is manifest that these honours are done *to* these Images as well as *to* their Prototypes; as appears further from the tenth Conclusion of the first Chapter, and the twentieth of the second; which Conclusions are improvable also to the case of burning of Incense, and lighting up wax-candles, and bringing of Oblations to these symbolical Presences, which please the simple people when they visibly behold their Masters to whom they pay their Religious Tribute or Offerings, whether Money or money-worth. What Idolatry can be more Pagan-like than this? So little satisfactory is it what Dr. *Thorndike* produces for the freeing of the Church of *Romes* Image-worship from Idolatry.

To the third Antithesis, Dr. *Thorndike*, says he, *excuses Invocation of Saints from Idolatry. Repl.* Truly upon my perusal of that Chapter in Dr. *Thorndike*, I think my Adversary has little reason to brag of the Excuse there made for it. For First, Dr. *Thorndike* does freely confess the Saints know nothing of our particular necessities unless God reveal them to them. Secondly, he accuses Invocation of Saints of Novelty, as not being owned and used by the Church till a good while after *Constantine*. Thirdly, he says the abuse has increased so far that the same things are desired of them, (of the Virgin *Mary* especially) and in the same terms in which they are desired of God even in the holy Scriptures. Fourthly, That the appearance of Devotion to the mother is visibly and outwardly

no leſs than to the Son (which is equal to that to God himſelf) whence any mean Logician may infer, that the appearance of Devotion to the Mother is no leſs than that to God himſelf. Does not this hugely excuſe the Romiſh Invocation of Saints from Idolatry? But you'l ſay, Certainly I am miſtaken in the place. No, no, I am not. Now comes the Excuſe; ' So that were there not a profeſſion of ' that Church extant, contradicting the proper ſenſe ' of ſuch Prayers to the Saints, and forceing them ' that addreſs them, unleſs they will contradict ' themſelves, to abate their own meaning, and to ' expound them to ſignify no more than the Saints ' obtaining that of God which they are deſired to ' grant of themſelves, they could not be excuſed of ' Idolatry. Of which the brief ſenſe is, That unleſs the profeſſion of the Church contradicted their Practiſe, which is Idolatrous, *viz.* their profeſſion of one God the giver of every good and perfect gift, (for I know no other publick Profeſſion then that he can mean) they cannot be excuſed of Idolatry. As if profeſſing things repugnant to Idolatry, and in the mean time committing it againſt their Profeſſion, could ſave them from being Idolaters, more than from being Murtherers and Adulterers, becauſe they profeſs the Decalogue. Or as if there being a Society of men that did in Special manner profeſs Civility, and yet would call any one all the ill names imaginable, might put it off by ſaying, theſe names and railings are indeed utterly repugnant to our publick Profeſſion if they be taken in their proper ſenſe; and

there-

therefore you muſt interpret them in ſuch a ſenſe as is not repugnant to our known Profeſſion; For we declare to all the world that we are civil Gentlemen and very much every mans humble ſervant. Would this ſeem a ſolid excuſe and not rather matter of laughter to all that heard it? Such an Excuſe might excuſe the Heathen who held one ſupreme God fountain of all things, in all the Idolatrous Rites of worſhipping their *Dæmons*. For they might ſay, no other ſenſe is to be given of thoſe Idolatrous Rites then will conſiſt with the belief of one ſupreme Deity the Fountain of all Good. Nay, they of the *Roman* Church might Sacrifice whole Hecatombs of Oxen to their Saints, and excuſe it, becauſe it is not to be taken in the proper ſenſe of ſuch Sacrifices, but in ſuch a ſenſe as is conſiſtent with the knowledge and profeſſion of the onely one true God. So that that which is an excuſe for any Idolatry, is indeed an Excuſe for none.

And beſides this, Dr. *Thorndikes* excuſe, though it were ſolid as to this particular point of Idolatry, yet it is too ſcant to reach others. For the mere Invocation of this or that particular Saint for an *Ora pro nobis*, it implying ſuch an excellency as is in God alone, (according to Dr. *Thorndikes* own acknowledgment) will be Idolatry, by the eighth Concluſion of the ſecond Chapter of my Antidote. And then conſidering their Canonization, the erection of dedicated Images or ſymbolical Preſences to them, the belief that ſome are proper to intercede for one thing others for another, and that offerings are brought to them upon the good

either expected or obtained by their negotiations for us, what is this Invocation thus circumſtantiated different from the Invocation of the *Dii Medioxumi* of the Heathen which all will ſay is Idolatry? And therefore this muſt be Idolatry, by the third and fourth Concluſions of the firſt Chapter. See alſo the eighteenth of the ſecond. So that in an ill hour has my Adverſary brought Dr. *Thorndike* to be a compurgator of his Church from the ſtain of Idolatry in the buſineſs of Invocation of Saints. But it may be he will make amends in the laſt *Antitheſis.*

Dr. *Thorndike*, ſays he, (*Chap.* 1.) *avers to all the world, that thoſe that ſeparate from the Church of* Rome *as Idolaters are thereby Shiſmaticks before God.* *Repl.* I confeſs he does ſay ſo. And I never read it but am ſurprized with amazement at it, that any one that profeſſes himſelf a Proteſtant, ſhould adventure to pronounce ſuch a ſpeech. For my own part I can profeſs truly and unfeignedly (and I think there is not any one but will believe me that knows me or has read my writings, eſpecially my Myſtery of Godlineſs and my Dialogue, where drawing the beſt and the moſt benign repreſentation I can of Providence and the affairs of the world in all Ages as to Religion, I ſtrain my little Wit to the utmoſt to make the Idolatry of the Pagans look as tolerably and excuſably as I can) I ſay I profeſs unfeignedly that I am not conſcious to my ſelf of any ſuperſtitious hurry or fright and over ſcrupulous fear of committing Idolatry where none is to be committed, that carries me

me into this judgment touching the Idolatries of the Church of *Rome*; nor can any thing possibly tempt me to it, it being so contrary to my nature to find any more faults in the world then needs must; and I think any one will easily discern it is not any way for my Interest to declare this fault I find, if it were not true. But it is pure and impartial Reason, and something better and higher in my esteem than Reason, that does assure me of the Truth of what I do in this Case thus pronounce against my own natural Inclination and Interest. Whence I am well assured, that in all integrity of Conscience other men having the fear of God before their eyes may be also fully persuaded of these Idolatries I charge the Church of *Rome* with, and consequently be necessarily ingaged to quit her Communion, and separate from her. Now what Protestant, nay what Christian would ever think, or whisper within himself, much less aver to all the world, that such a separation is Schism before God, or *in Foro Divino?* especially considering that the Opinions and Practises for which the party separates are not Catholick but After-Inventions and Customs of the Church degenerating, as Dr *Thorndike* himself cannot deny. This Instance I give, at least *in Foro Divino,* certainly would be no Schism, though the Church of *Rome* were guilty of no Idolatry. And therefore I am sorry so venerable a Person should be so rash and precipitant in his censure against his fellow-Protestants.

But in the mean time will my Adversary say, *It is*

is apparent notwithstanding that Dr. Thorndike *has quitted the Church of* Rome *of the charge of Idolatry in this last* Antithesis. *Repl.* I grant he supposes you no Idolaters, but how does he prove you none? I have demonstrated over and over again in my Antidote that you are Idolaters, and you have not been able to inervate one proof. Now let us consider the demonstrations of Dr. *Thorndike* upon which he builds his assertion so prodigiously Paradoxical to all Protestants, a thing never uttered by any member of the reformed Churches before. I have poized his weights, and fathomed the measures of his Reasonings to the utmost length and extent of them, but find all too light and scant to make good so strange a Conclusion. The utmost he says to prove you no Idolaters is this;

First, saith he, *The Church of* Rome *is a true Church, but a true Church presupposeth the profession of so much of Christianity as is necessary to the Salvation of all Christians, and therefore men may be saved in the Church of* Rome. *But no Idolaters can be saved. Therefore the Church of* Rome *are no Idolaters.*

Secondly, *The Church of* Rome *being a true Church must needs profess the true God, and therefore if they believe that which they profess they cannot honour any Creature as they honour God, knowing every Creature to be an infinite distance below him, and therefore they cannot be Idolaters.*

Thirdly and lastly, *A true Church, which therefore professes the onely true God, does necessarily profess*

to

to deteſt all Idolatry; Which deteſtation of Idolatry the Church of Rome *does expreſly profeſs, which profeſſion therefore unleſs they expreſly renounce they cannot expreſly be Idolaters.*

This is the utmoſt (and repreſented to the utmoſt) of Mr. *Thorndikes* Reaſons whereby he would prove the Church of *Rome* to be no Idolaters; All which he makes to depend upon that grand Aſſertion, *That the Church of* Rome *is a true Church.*

To which before we can ſay, I or No, we muſt underſtand what is meant by a true Church. For, *true*, ſometimes ſignifies as much as pure and ſincere without mixture of any other with this Nature or formal Eſſence which is really here. As that is ſaid to be *true* Wine that has no other liquour mingled with it, and that *true* Gold that is not adulterated with any baſe alloy. And in this ſenſe I flatly deny the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church. But there is another ſenſe of true which excludes not impurity or ſome hurtfull ſuperaddition to the nature and form of the thing, the true formal nature of the thing ſtill exiſting there: As ſome ſubtil poyſon conveyed into Wine, the Wine is true Wine ſtill; And an houſe infected with the Plague, or whoſe walls are over-run with the Leproſie is a true houſe ſtill; Or, if it be not too homely a compariſon, a pair of Sheep-clippers ſhears fallen into the pitch-pan, and ſo all over beſmeared with pitch, is a true pair of ſhears ſtill; all theſe having the true and eſſential form whereby they are conſtituted ſuch. And they have an aptitude

titude in themselves for those ends they were made, though their actual usefulness is for the present taken away or turned into the contrary by what incumbers them or is added to them; but the definition of Wine, an House, and pair of shears doth still belong to them and is truly predicated of them.

Now therefore though I will neither aver nor deny the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church, you making so ill use of all our fair and ingenuous Concessions, yet I will suppose with Dr. *Thorndike* the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church; and that to be a true Church, is to profess all those Articles of the Christian Faith, to have that form of Government, suppose Episcopal, which was in the Primitive Church, to administer the Sacraments in that form of words the Primitive Church did, and in a word to profess so much of Christianity and preach it, as of it self, if there were no other Impediments added, would be sufficient to Salvation. And so supposing the Church of *Rome* to profess all those things which the true and unapostatized Church professed, (which were then and are still of themselves effectual for Salvation if men be not wanting to themselves) in this regard I confess she may be said to be a true Church. For so much as such a definition of a true Church would be competible to her. But all this supposed and admitted, I utterly deny that there is any validity at all in Dr. *Thorndikes* Arguments to prove she is not an Idolatrous Church. For a true wife according to definition of Law, yet may be a foul adulteress and noi-

somly

ſomly infected with the diſeaſe of her Uncleanneſs, and a true Houſe may be infected with the Plague, or ſtand in Peſtilential air, or be infeſted with the Devil or evil Spirits.

And now therefore to Anſwer to his firſt Argument, I ſay it does not follow becauſe the Church of *Rome* is a true Church men may be ſaved in it, becauſe a thing may truly be, what it is ſaid to be, by reaſon of its intrinſick form and nature, and yet notwithſtanding be in ſuch Circumſtances, that unleſs it be extricated out of them, it is made quite uſeleſs for the end it was ordained, and for which it has ſtill an aptitude were it extricated and cleared from the preſent Incumbrances, and admixtures; as in the example of the pair of Shears, of the Houſe, and of the Wine with poyſon in it, and the like; Which for the preſent, though it be a true Houſe, a true pair of Shears, true Wine, *&c.* yet they are not good. They retain the form but fall ſhort of the end, nay are quite oppoſite to it. And ſo they in the Church of *Rome*, though a true Church, fall ſhort of their Salvation, nay fall into eternal damnation by reaſon of the deadly poyſon in their Church which they wilfully keep infuſed in it.

To his ſecond Argument I Anſwer, That they that profeſs the true God may notwithſtanding commit Idolatry, as I have demonſtrated at large in my Idea of Antichriſtianiſm, Chap. 6. and Chap 8. of the firſt Book. And no man doubts but the

Iſraelites

Israelites committed Idolatry even then when they professed the Worship of the true God. And the *Indians* at this day who Worship their Pa-gods and are universally accounted Idolaters, I am certainly informed have a clear notion of the true God the Creatour of all things. Besides, this Argument of Dr. *Thorndikes* supposes that which is notoriously false, as if there could be no Idolatry unless the Creature were so honoured as if it were done to God himself: Which is abundantly confuted out of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth Conclusions of the first Chapter of my Antidote. And lastly, they do *de facto* give that honour to the Creature that is due to God alone. And there is no arguing against experience.

His last Argument I conceive is the infirmest of all, and the Conclusion the faintest of all, and is a kind of tacit insinuation that they are indeed Idolaters but not expres ones, as if their Hypocrisie could avail any thing with God, or free them from that condemnation that attends all that are Idolaters. Is the business then come onely to this, that the Romanists are not professed Idolaters? I wonder who ever professed themselves Idolaters that were serious in their Idolatry! For serious Idolatry always implies ignorance and mistake in the Idolater, though the Crime of Idolatry be so exceeding hainous, by Conclusion 4th. Chapter 2d.

But it being probable that Dr. *Thorndike* had a greater kindness for the Church of *Rome* then thus, and that by this last Argument also he would prove

prove them to be really no Idolaters, let us ſuppoſe it, and ſee how well his Argument will conclude it. They expreſly profeſs their deteſtation of Idolatry, nor make any expreſs renunciation of that profeſſion, therefore they are no Idolaters. To which I Anſwer, An unjuſt man or Extortioner, one that blinded with Covetouſneſs does unjuſt actions, does expreſly profeſs his deteſtation of injuſtice, nor renounces that profeſſion; does it follow therefore that he is not an unjuſt man? Or to make an Hypotheſis ſomething more operoſe, though ſufficiently pertinent to the Occaſion, we will ſuppoſe a conſiderable number of Jews in ſome Kingdom having misbehaved themſelves, out of fear of puniſhment to poſſeſs themſelves of ſome ſtrong Caſtle of the Prince of the Countrey, and there continuing a conſiderable time to exerciſe their Religion, and for better ſhow to write at the upper end of the Hall where they meet, *Moſes* Decalogue in golden Capital letters, making great profeſſion of the righteouſneſs of the Laws of that Decalogue, but in the mean time for the indulging to themſelves the pleaſures of the fleſh as well as for the ſupplying their neceſſities and ſecuring themſelves, ſhould make particular Laws and Decrees amongſt themſelves for the plundring and ſpoyling the Country people as they went to Market, and killing ſuch as reſiſted, and ſhould declare it Lawfull to Raviſh the Women they met with, interpreting the Law againſt Adultery touching Jewiſh Women onely that are of their own Religion, and Theft, and Murder, of Plundring

or

or killing those of the common wealth of *Israel*, not Aliens and Strangers, which their Law makes no provision for as they will pretend, that take upon them to be the Interpreters thereof. Now if any one should accuse them of Adultery, Theft and Murder committed against their Princes Subjects, and they should plead or any for them, that they cannot possibly be Robbers, Murderers or Adulterers, because they expressly profess their open detestation thereof, nor have any where renounced that Profession, the Decalogue of *Moses* also witnessing for them, writ in great Capital letters in their very Hall where they dayly meet, in which it is expressly said, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*, *Thou shalt do no Murder*, *Thou shalt not Steal*, they notwithstanding making those particular Decrees amongst themselves and acting accordingly, would not the Apology seem vain or impious? How then can the express Profession of the Church of *Rome* against Idolatry excuse her from Idolatry when they make particular Decrees of worshipping the Host with *Latria*, of Invocating the Saints and bowing to their Images, and practise it in such Circumstances as I have again and again declared. Nay when these Decrees are made by general Councils as they pretend, how can they be but express Idolaters and renounce their profession against Idolatry as much they can do? For no serious Idolater takes himself to be so. Wherefore we see how hugely unconcluding every Argument of Dr. *Thorndikes* is whereby he would prove the Church of *Rome* no Idolaters

But

But I have over and over again demonstrated them to be Idolaters in this my Antidote, nor has my Adversary produced any thing that in the least manner enervates any of my Arguments; nor can he prop himself by the Authority of Dr. *Thorndike*, it being so without all ground and Reason.

From all which, that Imputation I hope by this time is washed off, That my Arguments are *mere blustering words, and I unconcerned how true or false they are*: whenas if my Adversary be a man of sense, as truly I presume him to be, he cannot but feel by this that my words are not a storm and thunderclap without a bolt, but that they carry along with them what is solid and strong. And verily for Dr. *Thorndike*, himself being so venerable and Learned a Person and of that judgement and sincerity, after a Cause is so throughly canvassed on all sides as it has been betwixt you and me and him and my self about the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, if he were now alive, (as it has pleased God to take him out of this life and translate him, as I hope, to a better, since the finishing of this my Reply and before the transcribing of it) I believe he would not stick to conclude her guilty of Idolatry and that he and I should be fully agreed in these Points.

Which I am the more easily induced to believe from what he wrote in a letter about a year before he died; which Clause does plainly seem to null this fourth and greatest *Antithesis* betwixt him and me, *viz.* That the separating from

the Church of *Rome* upon the account of Idolatry is Schiſm before God. His words, as I had them faithfully conveyed to me by a worthy friend, are theſe; *To pray to the Saints for thoſe things which onely God can give, as all Papiſts do, is in the proper ſenſe of the words down right Idolatry.* I but here my Adverſary will be forward to Reply, But ſo long as the words may be figuratively underſtood we are excuſed of Idolatry. But let him hear how Dr. *Thorndike* himſelf obviates this ſubterfuge: *If they ſay their meaning is by a figure onely to deſire them to procure their requeſts of God, how dare any Chriſtian truſt his Soul with that Church which teacheth that which muſt needs be Idolatry in all that underſtand not that figure*: Which is ſpoken with incomparable judgement and modeſty and tender Civility to that Church, but, I promiſe you, in effect charges them as home, as to this point, as if he had ſaid in a word, *They are all down right Idolaters.* From whence it will neceſſarily follow, That he changed his opinion before he dyed, and held that to ſeparate from the Church of *Rome* upon the account of Idolatry is not Schiſm before God.

Now that he ſays they are all down right Idolaters is manifeſt: Becauſe he ſays all that underſtand not that figure, which may excuſe them of Idolatry, are ſo. Now I am well aſſured, and he could not chuſe but be ſo too, that the moſt Learned of them underſtand not that figure, there being no ſuch figure in all Rhetorick yet, unleſs they have made of late a new Figure calling it,

Quidlibet

Quidlibet pro quolibet, that is, *the putting any thing for any thing*, which will be a colour for all the Nonsense in the world that ever was, is, or can be writ or spoken. But men can no more make what *figures* they please in *Rhetorick* then they can make what *Moods* they please in the three figures in *Logick*. But all must be measured by the end of each Art, *Bene disserere* in the one, and *Bene dicere* in the other; what is not consentaneous to the former can be no Precept in *Logick*, and what not to the latter none in *Rhetorick*. And if there be the pretence of the use of any figure acknowledged in *Rhetorick*, which is not consentaneous to that end, the figure thus pretended to be used cannot be used, but the words will at the peril of the speaker remain in their proper sense. As if some wretched extravagant fellow should venture to begin his Prayer thus, *O infinitely weak, unwise, and unholy Lord God*, and pretend it is an *Irony*, and that he speaks by contraries, would this excuse him from horrid blasphemy? Surely no. For the use of the Figure in this place is not consentaneous to the general End of *Rhetorick* which is *Ars bene dicendi*, which no loathsom, disharmonious and absurd speech can agree with. Wherefore if a figure cannot be admitted here where there is one to which it is so obvious to refer the speech, how can the pretence of a figure excuse that speech which it will puzzle any man to find a figure to refer it to. As for Example, if one should pray thus to St. *Francis, O holy St.* Francis *give me the spirit of Grace in this life, and eternal Glory in the*

life to come. Upon which one crying out, *Down right Idolatry*, if he that addreſſed this abſurd and Idolatrous Prayer, ſhould ſay he meant *figuratively*, intending no more then thus, *O holy St.* Francis *pray to God to give me the ſpirit of Grace, &c.* this ſpeech alſo being ſo loathſom, harſh and ſcandalous can be no *figurative* ſpeech but is neceſſarily ſhut up in the proper ſenſe of the words, and as the other was *horrid blaſphemy*, ſo this is *down right Idolatry*, as Dr. *Thorndike* ſpeaks.

This is clear demonſtration to any one that conſiders the caſe impartially; whence it is plain that this fourth *Antitheſis* betwixt Dr. *Thorndike* and my ſelf is quite broke a pieces, and that we are agreed in this, That to ſeparate from the Church of *Rome* upon the account of Idolatry is not Schiſm before God. For as much as *to pray to the Saints for thoſe things which God alone can give, as all Papiſts do, is in the proper ſenſe of the words down right Idolatry.* And I have plainly demonſtrated there is no changing the ſenſe of the words by a figure, for as much as there is no figure to refer the ſpeech to, or if there were, there is no legitimate uſe of any ſuch figure, becauſe it would be no ornament or perfection of ſpeech but a loathſom blemiſh thereof, and therefore no more a figure than a piece of dung hung at the Ear in a ſtring is an Ear-Jewel.

Wherefore, as I ſaid, Dr. *Thorndike* coming ſo readily off of himſelf, in this fourth and laſt *Antitheſis*, which indeed is founded in a breach alſo

also upon the third *Antitheſis*, he ſo plainly declaring ſuch an Invocation of Saints to be down right Idolatry which yet all Papiſts uſe; for all they cannot but remember the Saints to be Gods Creatures, and therefore commit Idolatry with them though they remember them to be Gods Creatures; Which enervates alſo the ſecond *Antitheſis*, he indeavouring to prove that the honouring the Images of the Saints would be no Idolatry ſo long as we remember them to be Gods Creatures; I cannot but hope if he had lived and peruſed this carefull and diſtinct Diſceptation, he would have come off in all. For how could he ſtick in the firſt *Antitheſis*, at the acknowledging their Idolatry in the worſhipping the Hoſt? Whenas, though they think the Bread is not there, yet they conceiving the individual matter of the Bread tranſubſtantiated into the Body of Chriſt, and ſo Hypoſtatically united with the Divinity, and upon that account purſue it with their devotion and Divine Adoration, hit upon the ſaid Individual matter untranſubſtantiated and remaining Bread ſtill, and ſo do plainly give Divine Adoration to Bread, as much as the *Perſians* to the Sun who take it for the Supreme Intellectual Deity.

But take him agreed no further then he actually was before he dyed, which is ſo far as to declare all the Church of *Rome* down right Idolaters, he does thereby freely acknowledge the Church of *England* and other Proteſtant Churches to be no Schiſmaticks either before God or be-

fore men. Nay, says he, (Weights and Measures *Chap.* 1.) if the Papists be Idolaters, we are to own the separation for our own Act and to glory in it. For it is done by Gods expreſs Command, *Come out of her my people,* &c. Apoc. 18. 4. But for the Papists being Idolaters, what ever the declarations of Dr. *Thorndike* are, my demonſtrations in my Antidote and what occurs in my Reply do evidently and irrefragably evince it in all Points they are charged with. And *thereupon* you ſee what an agreeable Concluſion comes from us both. It is Gods expreſs Command to come out of her.

And if this be not Agreement enough, conconſidering Dr. *Thorndike* has now laid down that load of Earth that depreſſes the mind, and is, as we in Charity hope, among the bleſſed, I queſtion not but he clearly diſcerns his miſtakes in all four *Antitheſes* betwixt us. So that it is very credible that the two Doctors are agreed fully in theſe Points, though I pronounce it with ſome peril of bringing my Antagoniſt upon me again, who craves reſpite for his pen onely ſo long as till the two Doctors be fully agreed, but then Dr. *More*, says he, *ſhall hear more from me if he deſire it.*

But we being thus fully agreed, yet I confeſs I ſhall deſire to hear no more from you, unleſs you will imitate your fellow-Combatant, and wear no Mask, but do as I do, ſpeak verily as you think and bring no Arguments but ſuch as you in your own Conſcience think true and concluding; and then

then I dare ſay the Game will ſoon be at an end. But there may be made a ſhow of Confutation *in infinitum* to amuſe or quiet thoſe of your own Party that have not the leaſure or capacity of reading and underſtanding what is Written. But if you think to make any Rejoinder, if I find you bring any thing material more than what you have ſuggeſted already, I will, God willing, take the pains to Anſwer; but if not, I ſhall neither give you nor my ſelf any further trouble, but leave the world to judge. And ſo, Fellow-Combatant, I bid you heartily farewell. And that you may be the better aſſured I part with you in Charity, and that I may appear to you clear of that Imputation of Uncharitableneſs which you labour ſo in this laſt Section to caſt upon me, peruſe the fifth Paragraph of this tenth Chapter, as alſo the Parable in the Preface to my Antidote; which you ſeem to have been loath to take notice of, that you might with better ſhow accuſe me ſo much of uncharitableneſs as you here have done. But it being ſo lively a Repreſentation of the real and ſincere Charity of thoſe Miniſters of the Goſpel, that plainly and faithfully tell thoſe of your Church the great peril of continuing in it, I will cloſe all with that Apology.

There was a certain Knight bravely mounted, as it might ſeem, and in goodly equipage, in bright Armour, a rich Scarf about his Shoulders, and a large plume of Feathers in his Helmet,

who was bound for the Castle of Health, seated on an high Hill not unlike to the *Domicilium Salutis* in *Cebes* his Table, which therefore he easily kept in his eye. But the way he was in, being something stony and rough, and leading not so directly as he thought, to the desired Castle, he diverted out of the way, and descended into a green Plain; but not knowing whether it was all passable to the Castle, called to some Loyterers there in the field to inquire of them; who came right willingly to the Knight, scraping many legs to him, and desiring him to tell his demands.

There was an old Shepherd likewise not far off, who, by that time this idle people had got to the Knight, had come down to him also. Friends, said he, to those men he called, Is the way passable and safe through this green Plain to yonder Castle? pointing to the *Castle of Health* with his warder; very safe, may it please your Worship, said they, and shrugging their Shoulders, and scraping many Legs, asked a Largess of the Knight, pretending they had been at common work not far off, whereupon the Knight put his hand into his pocket and gave them liberally. But are there no Bogs, said he, nor Lakes betwixt this and the Castle? Some small inconsiderable Sloughes it may be, said they, but you will meet with the *Holy Society of the Wipers* every where, who will be ready to wipe you as clean as a Clock before you come at the Castle. And being so excellently well mount-

mounted as we ſee you are, namely upon that famous ſteed the infallible-footed *Aplanedo*, ſo good an Horſe as that he never ſtumbles, your Worſhip need fear no diſaſter at all: Beſides, the Beaſt, God bleſs him, has a Noſe like any Hound, and by a miraculous Sagacity, without any Reaſon or Humane Literature, with an unerring certainty he can ſmell out the right way, and ſo ſecure you from all danger. To ſay nothing how excellent he is at the ſwimming any Water, and how he can tread the very Air he is ſo high metald and light Footed. *Onely be ſure to keep faſt in the Saddle.*

And then, Sr. Knight, ſaid the Shepherd, if the wind blow fair, the plumes in your Helmet may help to ſupport you both; but if not, ſome Angel from Heaven may take you by the Creſt of your Helmet, as he did the Prophet *Habbakuk* by the hair of his head, when he carried him through the air from *Judea* to *Babylon.*

The Knight looking back (for he was not aware of the Shepherd at this time) What conceited old man is this, ſaid he, that talks thus phancifully? May it pleaſe your Worſhip, he is a Shepherd, ſaid they, and has a flock on yonder little Hill hard by; but he is one of the moſt ſelf-conceated old Fools that ever your Worſhip met with in all your days: He thinks that all skill and knowledge lyes within the compaſs of his bald pate and wrinkled fore-head, though few or none are of the ſame Opinions with himſelf. Sr. Knight,

Knight, said the Shepherd, I pretend to no skill nor knowledge but what is certainly within my own Ken; but what I know I love to speak freely. And I tell you, Sr. Knight, unless you be stark staring mad you will never follow these mens Counsels, nor venture over this Moor to that Castle: for you will be swallowed up Horse and Man into a fathomless Lake of ill-sented mire, for all the nice Nostrils of *Aplanedo*. You was in a more hopefull way before, though something rough; but it is so streight before you come at the Castle, that you could never have got through unless you had left *Aplanedo* behind you. He's an old Cholerick Dotard, said those other fellows; be but sure to keep the Saddle and we dare warrant your Worship (our lives for yours) that *Aplanedo* will carry you safe through all dangers.

Wherefore upon the renewal of the high conceit the Knight had before of his Steed, and those confident Animations of his Mercenary Counsellers, he set on in a direct line toward the Castle over this Moor, the Shepherd looking after him to see the event. But the Knight had not rid two or three Bow-shots from the place, but the Shepherd saw them suddenly sink Horse and Man into the ground, so that they were both buried alive in the mire.

Whereupon fetching a deep sigh after so Tragical a Spectacle, he returned with a sad heart and slow pace towards his Sheep on the top of the Hill, drailing his Sheephook behind him, as they

they do their Spears, at the Funeral of a Souldier: whom his Dog followed with a like soft pace, hanging down his head, and letting his tail flag, as if he had a mind to conform to both the sorrows and postures of his Master. But those other false Companions had somewhat before this got to a lone Ale-house not far off, to spend the Knights Largess merrily with a bonny young Hostess, and in plenty of good Ale and Cakes to celebrate his Funeral.

Now I dare appeal to the Judgment of any indifferent Reader which of these Parties, the old free-spoken Shepherd, or those Mercenary Flatterers, had the greater share of Charity: and would have him consider with himself in what a sad condition those of the Church of *Rome* are, who having the opportunity of being better instructed, as the Knight had, are yet led away Captive by such cunning Deceivers, which is the main state of the Controversie. *John* 15. 22. *If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin*, saith our blessed Saviour in the Gospel.

THE END.